THE MARCHES ON WASHINGTON 1963 AND 1983: A COMPARATIVE CONTENT ANALYSIS OF SELECTED SPEECHES

By

GAIL ETHEL ARMSTEAD

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1985

Copyright 1985

by

Gail Ethel Armstead

In memory of my father, Dennis H. Armstead, Sr., whose love has given me faith; my grandmother, Stella M. Shuler, whose strength has given me hope; and to Dr. James T. Wills with whom, I made this commitment to pursue my doctorate degree (I kept my promise).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I dedicate this study to my mother, Ann M. Armstead, and my brother and sister-in-law, Dennis, Jr., and Sandra Armstead, for their love and support; to my family and many friends for their prayers, encouragement, and help, especially Tanya, Jan, Shirley, Kelly, Mittie, Adisa, Larry, Skip and Uncle Gus. I would like to thank Dot, Kathy, Linda, Willa, and Jo for their technical assistance.

I would like to acknowledge my committee without whose advice, concern, and direction, I could not have accomplished the completion of this program; Dr. Norman Markel, chairman; Dr. Donald Williams, co-chairman; Dr. Anthony Clark, Dr. Mildred Hill-Lubin; Dr. Henry Tosi; and Dr. Rosie Bingham. I would also like to give special thanks to Emory Searcy, Jr. and the other Atlanta based coordinators for the 1983 March, and to the Martin Luther King Center for Non-Violent Social Change, Inc.

To God, everything I have, and all that I am, I owe to thee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS....iv

ABSTRACT....vi

CHAPTERS

I. INTRODUCTION....1

General Perspective on the Marches....1
Historical Background....5
Rhetorical Amalgams....15
Rationale and Limitations....22

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE....24

Studies on the Marches on Washington....24
Rhetorical and Content Analysis Studies....29
Research Questions....35

III. METHODOLOGY....37

Sampling Procedure....37
Data Collection....40
Category and Unit Determination....42
Research Design, Statistical Test, and Procedure....45
Notes....48

IV. RESULTS....49

Analysis of Time Orientation Design....49
Analysis of Goal Design....52
Analysis of Action Design....56
Analysis of Appeals Design....59

V. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS....63

APPENDICES

A. Sample of Coded Statements....73

B. Transcript Standardization: Word Count....75

REFERENCES....76

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH....83

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

THE MARCHES ON WASHINGTON 1963 AND 1983:
A COMPARATIVE CONTENT ANALYSIS OF SELECTED SPEECHES

By

Gail Ethel Armstead

May, 1985

Chairman: Norman N. Markel
Co-Chairman: Donald E. Williams
Major Department: Speech

The purpose of this study was to determine if there were any differences in the rhetoric of the 1963 and 1983 Marches on Washington. A content analysis of the selected speeches was used as the basis for obtaining the results. Four categories were defined for analysis: (1) Time orientation which served to indicate whether the speakers centered their ideas in the past, present or future; (2) Goal which indicated whether the focus of the speakers was on jobs, peace, or freedom; (3) Action which indicated the method of obtaining the goals, either assimilation, separation or revolution; and (4) Appeals which indicated the styles of persuasion used either emotional, logical, or ethical. Six speeches were selected from each March for coding across the four categories. The results revealed that the rhetoric was far more similar than different when comparing the 1963 and 1983 Marches on Washington. The focus of the speakers' statements in both years was in the same time reference, on the same goal, and advocating the same action. The main difference was in the type of appeal used to convey the message.

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The 1963 and 1983 Marches on Washington, D.C., were two of the most significant rhetorical events of this century. On both occasions hundreds of thousands of American citizens from diverse backgrounds came together in a united effort to speak out with their presence for civil rights. What those Marches gave to millions of Americans through their rhetoric was a sense of patriotic pride and responsibility, and hope for a better future! Why was there such a need for the Marches? What was the statement to be made?

In 1963, 100 years and 240 days after the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation, Black people were not free to pursue the rights constitutionally guaranteed. Those that came to Washington on August 28, 1963, came from points all over America and some from overseas. They came to say "that Black people had been waiting for 100 years and 240 days and that they were still not free and that 100 years and 241 days were too long to wait" (Bennett, 1979, p. 284).

The idea of a March on Washington was not a new one. For A. Phillip Randolph, who was at the time, the seventy-four year old, President of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters and Vice-President of the AFL-CIO, the March was a culmination of a dream long held (Anderson, 1973). Randolph had always felt that a show of unity by thousands of Black Americans would make a statement to this country that could not be ignored. He was right. Many changes came about as a result of that March

and doors once closed began to open in housing, employment, and social services (Franklin, 1974).

Twenty years later, on Saturday, August 27, 1983, there was a second March on Washington. Billed as the "Twentieth Anniversary March" (Organizer's Manual, 1983), it served to rekindle the desire for jobs, peace, and freedom. In the second March, those who were advocates of civil rights for Blacks were joined by many other groups who wanted to gain assurance that their rights as citizens would no longer be denied. Times had changed since the 1963 March; Blacks could come to the nation's capital in 1983 without fear, by any mode of transportation they chose, and gain lodgings at any of the finest accommodations. They could eat wherever, and whenever. Things had changed for the better, but the changes were not enough. There were still many more major changes needed.

In a basic sense the 1963 and 1983 Marches were unifying experiences that brought light and hope to those persons in the midst of tough times. "Tough times" in this context covers the gamut of unemployment, economic depression, illiteracy, hunger, and homelessness. What could be done to demonstrate the problems facing millions of Americans was the question facing concerned citizens prior to both Marches. The Marches were attempts to dramatize the plight of not only Blacks, but all those experiencing tough times. Almost everyone agreed that the Marches were impressive and made a significant impact on those who participated and those who watched and listened on radio and television (Bennett, 1979; Dennis, 1983; Maffre, 1963; and Milloy, 1983).

There are various approaches that can be taken in studying the two Marches on Washington. There were psychological and sociological

factors prevalent for research and analysis. The Marches can be reviewed by the scholars in journalism from the standpoint of media coverage, political science from the impact on foreign affairs or economics from the resulting changes in employment practices. The most obvious perspective could be provided by a rhetorical viewpoint. Never before had there been such an array of speakers, speaking to such a diverse audience under a common theme. On both occasions the participants gathered on the mall before the Lincoln Memorial with anticipation and apprehension. Questions were on everyone's mind: Why was there a need for these massive demonstrations? What did the leaders hope to accomplish? Would the Marches amount to no more than meaningless talk?

Was the 1983 March a mere repeat of the 1963 March? Times had changed; surely many people thought there must be a better way to address the problems in the eighties. Why weren't the mass media relied upon exclusively to deliver the message? In the United States of America, almost everyone had access to a television or radio; almost everyone could be reached through those channels. Coretta Scott King described the 1983 March as not a duplication or replication of the 1963 March on Washington but a "Twentieth Anniversary Celebration that affords us an opportunity to lock arms and struggle together until the last battle is won and we all can stand together and shout 'free at last'" (Organizer's Manual, 1983). For those who were present or even for those who watched the Marches on television, it was the size and composition of that large audience in attendance that made America take notice and listen. What did the speakers say and what did their message mean?

In answering these questions, a rhetorician can take numerous approaches depending on his/her areas of interest and expertise. Kenneth Burke and those utilizing his critical mode might decide that this was an excellent opportunity to use the dramatistic approach. "Burke's rhetorical philosophy evolved through literary criticism into social criticism, with the result that his dramatistic approach has a markedly sociopsychological tone" (Brock and Scott, 1980, p. 268). His critical method would call for the rhetorical scholar to look at all components of the Marches in order to identify the attitudes reflected in the events and the drama of the relationships that developed between the act, the scene, the agent, the agency, and the purpose (p. 353). Simons (1970) and Cathcart (1980) and those attracted to the critical approach they espouse may wish to view the Marches as a part of a social movement. Many historical writers viewed the 1963 March as an integral part of the Civil Rights Movement (Blair, 1977, and Blumberg, 1984). "Social movement" critics would seek to fit the Marches into their rhetorical definitions of a social movement, taking into consideration the Marches' leadership, membership, and the interaction with the value system of our national culture. Wichelns and Nichols (Linsley, 1968) and other advocates of the neo-Aristolelian approach may wish to view the Marches by the inter-weaving of the historical events surrounding them into a descriptive, evaluative, and interpretive analysis of the nature of the speeches. Whatever the avenue chosen for analysis, all will agree that the Marches on Washington offer the rhetorical scholar a magnitude of options.

This research will approach the Marches from a content analytic approach. It will utilize the historical approach of rhetoric to set

the context for the analysis of the speeches. The intent of this approach is to provide an objective analysis in order to compare the two Marches for rhetorical differences and similarities.

Historical Background

The March on Washington, D.C. in 1963 was the result of efforts begun in the early forties by A. Phillip Randolph. In January, 1941, Randolph advanced the idea of fifty to one hundred thousand Black people marching on the nation's capital to demand that the government do something to insure their employment in the defense industries (Anderson, 1973). In June, 1941, as the threat of the March intensified with the date scheduled for July 1, 1941, a meeting was called by President Franklin Roosevelt with Randolph, and a committee was appointed to draw up an executive order for submission to the Executive Office (Bennett, 1979). Randolph was then urged to call off the March by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and other White liberals, but he refused until there was an executive order. On Wednesday, June 25, 1941, President Roosevelt signed and issued Executive Order 8802, which prohibited discrimination in defense industries and established a wartime Fair Employment Commission. Randolph upheld his part of the agreement and postponed the March. On July 1, 1941, Randolph and a handful of supporters gathered at the Lincoln Monument to celebrate a victory that was won because 100,000 people didn't March (Bennett, 1979).

During the period of time between 1941 and 1963, the Black American changed in status as a result to a marked extent of two major wars, World War II, and the Korean War. The fight in battles overseas for freedom only served to bring about a greater awareness of the Black

American's lack of freedom at home. Racial integration began in the armed services at the close of World War II under President Truman and accelerated in the post-war years (Franklin, 1974). A special report was issued by the United States Army in 1951, which documented that the integration of Blacks had resulted in an overall gain for the army in effectiveness and management of troops and facilities.

During the fifties and early sixties, several significant changes were made to improve the condition of Blacks. The armed forces were not alone in reflecting the assault on discrimination and segregation. In 1950, for example, there were 177 local housing projects open to families of all races and creeds (Franklin, 1974, p. 465). In 1954, the Brown vs. the Board of Education case was one of five presented to the Supreme Court on the question of school desegregation. On May 17, 1954, Chief Justice Earl Warren delivered the opinion that segregation in the public schools was unconstitutional. Warren concluded for the Court "that in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate education facilities are inherently unequal" (Ploski and Kaiser, 1971, p. 28).

In 1955, the first nationally significant direct action to eliminate racial segregation took place (Bergman, 1969). Mrs. Rosa Parks' refusal to give up her seat on a Montgomery, Alabama, bus led to her jailing. The arrest of Mrs. Parks proved to be a catalyst for a boycott of the bus system by Montgomery's 50,000 Blacks. The boycott began on the day of Parks' trial and lasted 381 days, resulting in a Supreme Court decision that ruled Alabama laws requiring segregated seating on public conveyances were unconstitutional (D'Emilio, 1979, p. 113).

In 1956, the Civil Rights Act was proposed by President Dwight Eisenhower, but without the provision that the Justice Department could bring suit on behalf of Blacks denied the right to vote. President Eisenhower, who rejected the provision initially, later supported it; the Civil Rights Act of 1957 with this provision was passed in August, 1957 (Bergman, 1969). "This new law the first civil rights act since 1875, authorized the federal government to bring civil suits in its own name to obtain injunctive relief, in federal courts, where any person was denied or threatened in his right to vote" (Franklin, 1974, p. 475).

For every gain Black people made in those early struggles to elevate themselves, there were increased incidents of violence, jailings, and bombings. Despite the opposition, they persisted in their non-violent struggle to assure their civil rights following the lead of the emerging young President of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC). The SCLC was formed in 1957, by 115 Black leaders whom Martin Luther King, Jr., called together to plan a counter offensive against obstruction of school desegregation and voting rights. King was elected SCLC's first president (Blumberg, 1984; Oates, 1982; and Ploski and Kaiser, 1971).

As the struggle for racial integration in public facilities and educational institutions continued, there came a cry to unite. Those who were fighting for the right to vote in Mississippi, those who did battle for the desegregation of the education system in Alabama, and those in the major urban areas struggling for fair practices in assigning housing, had no other choice but to unite their efforts. "For several years before 1963 the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (which was founded in 1909) used the motto "Free by

'63." Other groups adopted the motto and focused more attention on the drive for equality" (Franklin, 1974, p. 481). And so it was to be that once again the vision of A. Phillip Randolph of hundreds of thousands of Black people marching on Washington began to take form.

Significantly, the year 1963 was the 100th Anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation by which President Abraham Lincoln abolished slavery (Ploski and Kaiser, 1971). The most propelling force that initiated the 1963 March was the series of violent incidents in Birmingham and on the Freedom rides by northern students into the South to participate in sit-ins at restaurants and department stores. The incidents in Birmingham had become a media event (Blumberg, 1984) and violence by citizens and law enforcement officers against unarmed men, women, and children engaged in peaceful demonstrations were graphically shown in homes throughout America. No more could the nation be ignorant as to what was happening in this and other cities.

In December, 1962, Randolph and Bayard Rustin began planning for a new March on Washington to link the demand for strong federal civil rights legislation with the labor movement's call for full employment, a higher minimum wage, and a guaranteed income (D'Emilio, 1979). "During the spring of 1963 Randolph recruited an impressive array of liberal labor, religious, and civil rights organizations in support of the March" (p. 121). The initial organizers who joined ranks with Randolph, who at the time was President of the Negro American Labor Council, were James Farmer, National Director of the Congress on Racial Equality (CORE); the Reverend Martin L. King, Jr., President, Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC); John Lewis, Chairman Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), Roy Wilkins, Executive Secretary,

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP); and Whitney Young, Executive Director, National Urban League (NUL) (Franklin, 1974, & Bennett, 1979). Several other organizations invited by the organizers, joined in the sponsorship of the March. Among them were the American Jewish Congress, The National Council of Churches' Commission on Race and Religion, The National Catholic Conference, and the United Auto Workers (Franklin, 1974). Dorothy I. Height, President of the National Council of Negro Women, was the only woman in the group of organizers (Organizer's Manual, 1983).

Bayard Rustin was made Co-Chairman of the March. He became the logistics expert and prime coordinator for all aspects of the March (Ploski & Kaiser, 1971). On Wednesday, August 28, 1963, the March on Washington became an historical occasion in American history. Over 200,000 Americans (Quarles, 1969; Ploski and Kaiser, 1971; and Franklin, 1974) White and Black, Protestant and Jewish, assembled for a nearly mile-long March from the Washington Monument to the Lincoln Memorial. The speakers at that first March represented several different groups and are as follows: A. Phillip Randolph, President, the Negro-American Labor Council; Roy Wilkins, Executive Secretary of NAACP; Floyd McKissick for James Farmer, National Director, Congress of Racial Equality, who at the time was in jail in Louisiana for his activities in a demonstration (Franklin, 1974); Whitney M. Young, Jr., Executive Director, National Urban League; Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., President, Southern Christian Leadership Conference; Walter Reuther, President United Auto Workers; Rabbi Jochim Prinz, President, American Jewish Congress; Matthew Ahmann, Executive Director, National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice; Reverend Eugene Carson Blake,

Vice-Chairman, National Council of Churches; and John Lewis, Chairman, Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee. In addition to the speakers, the voices of Mahalia Jackson, Odetta, and Peter, Paul and Mary were among those who inspired the crowd through song.

On that day more than twenty years ago the nation seemed to come together. People of various races sang together, cheered together and cried together, as they became one unifying force. A force that would return to their homes throughout America to continue to fight for civil rights.

During the next twenty years following the March on Washington many significant changes took place. In November, 1963, President John F. Kennedy was assassinated in Dallas, Texas. A feeling of despair enveloped the Black community where many of the citizens regarded Kennedy as their key link between the branches of federal government insofar as civil rights programs were concerned (Franklin, 1974).

In 1964, President Lyndon B. Johnson continued the commitment to civil rights policies that Kennedy had begun. With Presidential sponsorship, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was passed. This Act, subdivided into eleven sections, gave the attorney general additional power to protect citizens against discrimination and segregation in voting, education, and the use of public facilities. It established a federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and extended the tenure of the Civil Rights Commission until January, 1968. It required the elimination of discrimination in federally assisted programs and authorized the Office of Education to provide technical and financial assistance to communities engaged in racial desegregation (Ploski and Kaiser, 1971; Franklin, 1974; and Revolution in Civil Rights, 1968). Later in 1964,

Martin Luther King, Jr. received the Nobel Peace Prize in Oslo, Norway for showing the Western world that a struggle can be waged without violence (Oates, 1982).

In the years between 1965 and 1969, there were strides towards gaining guarantees of civil rights, but there were also great losses. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was signed by President Johnson. This act authorized the sending of federal examiners into the South, abolished literacy, knowledge, and character tests as qualifications for voting and eliminated poll taxes (Revolution, 1968). In 1966, Edward Brooke, a Republican from Massachusetts, was elected the first Black senator since the reconstruction period of the 1870s. The next year, Thurgood Marshall was nominated and confirmed as an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. The year 1968 was one of great tragedy, both Martin L. King, Jr., and Robert F. Kennedy, Senator from New York, were assassinated. During this same year, two notable strides were made, Shirley Chisolm, a Democrat from New York was elected the first Black woman to Congress and the Fair Housing Act was passed, which prohibited discrimination in the sale or rental of housing. In 1969 the Supreme Court ordered an end to all school desegregation "at once." The decision replaced the Warren Courts doctrine of implementing racial desegregation through "all deliberate speed" (Ploski and Kaiser, 1971).

The seventies saw numerous advances toward civil rights. In 1972, the Equal Opportunity Commission was granted the right to order companies and unions to cease racial, religious, and sexual discrimination, and the Supreme Court ruled that the Justice Department could require prior approval of a legislative reapportionment plan in southern

states before it was implemented, when such a plan threatened to dilute the equitable significance of Black voters (Fishel and Quarles, 1976).

In 1974, the Committee for Full Employment was formed by Coretta Scott King, Leonard Woodstock, and Augustus Hawkins to address the increasing problems of unemployment. In 1975, President Gerald Ford extended the Voting Rights Act of 1965. In 1978, the Judicial Reform Act created a large number of new federal judgeships to which President Jimmy Carter appointed the largest number of Blacks and females ever named to these positions in history (Sitkoff, 1981). Congress passed the Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment and Balance Growth Act which provided for a set of procedures for coordinating government policies in order to obtain employment goals; it would require the direct creation of jobs by government (Congressional Quarterly, 1978).

In the latter part of the Carter Administration, Blacks became the chief victims of economic failures, resulting in the highest Black jobless rate in over a decade. In the 1980 election most Blacks voted Democratic, although in fewer numbers, and a Republican returned to the Whitehouse (Sitkoff, 1981). The change in presidential administration was accompanied by numerous changes in civil rights policies. President Ronald Reagan ordered the Office of Federal Contracts Compliance Programs to halt enforcement activities, reduced the legal activities of the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department, and purged millions of poor from public welfare. He reduced food stamps and health care benefits, and stopped construction on new public housing units. The net effect was that much of the progress made against poverty in the 1960's and 1970's had been "wiped out" according to the New York Times (Marable, 1983). In 1982, President Reagan extended the

1965 Voting Rights Act for another twenty-five years (Blumberg, 1984). In addition, an appropriations bill removed the authority to litigate in discrimination cases from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (Organizer's Manual, 1983).

The planning for the 1983 March began in June of 1982. Coretta Scott King and Joseph Lowery issued an appeal to the organizers, leaders, and organizations of the first March to consider planning a "Twentieth Anniversary Celebration." On August 26-27, 1982, at the "Nineteenth Anniversary Celebration" in Atlanta, Georgia, over 200 representatives and leaders of various organizations and movements met. At that meeting the tentative proposal was evaluated and a mobilization plan was adopted. A list of groups and organizations which had formed since the 1963 March was developed. These groups would be invited to endorse and support the second March. After the meeting, two additional Co-Chairpersons were selected to work with Coretta King. They were Walter Fauntroy, District of Columbia, delegate and Chairman of the Board of SCLC and Benjamin Hooks, Executive Director, NAACP (Organizer's Manual, 1983).

In September, plans were made to call a national meeting of Black leaders on December 3, 1982. Fifty-five Black leaders met in Washington, D.C., at the Shiloh Family Life Center. At that meeting the Call to the Nation (Organizer's Manual, 1983) was adopted and sent to more than 500 religious, labor, and civil rights organizations and national Black leaders for their endorsement and support. On December 20, 1982, a statement was issued to the nation calling for a "New Coalition of Conscience for Jobs, Peace, and Freedom." This second document was sent to 1,000 leaders of other movements for their endorsement and support.

On January 13, 1983, the first meeting of the planning group for the "Twentieth Anniversary Celebration" was held at the Martin Luther King Center for Non-Violent Social Change in Atlanta, Georgia. The National Planning Council of the New Coalition became the decision making body for the celebration and was composed of representatives from 80 organizations. It was at this meeting that the final decision was made to hold a March on Washington to commemorate the Twentieth Anniversary of the historic 1963 March. The date was set for August 27, 1983, the place, Washington, D.C., and with over 500 organizations and individuals endorsing the March, the plans were put into action (Organizer's Manual, 1983).

On Saturday morning, August 27, 1983, the plan for the Twentieth Anniversary March on Washington was realized. Buses, planes, cars and other modes of transportation brought people from all over the country to the nation's capital. By early afternoon a crowd of at least 250,000 (Barker & Perl, 1983), gathered to see and listen to more than 70 speakers and entertainers. Unlike the well dressed crowd of 1963, this 1983 crowd had come in shorts, jeans, sundresses and other casual styles of attire. There was the appearance of a massive picnic, rather than the church meeting atmosphere of its predecessor (Dennis, 1983; Barker & Perl, 1983).

Not only had the dress of the crowd changed, but more significant was its change in composition. Numerous groups participated who were not involved in the 1963 March; moreover, their inclusion at that time was not considered. In 1983, however, these allied groups came to unite behind the theme of the 1983 March, "Jobs, Peace, and Freedom." The groups were so diverse, and so numerous it is difficult to obtain an

accurate count of their numbers. Those participating groups of particular significance included those related to women's rights movement, those involved in the gay rights movement, the American Indians, the AFL-CIO, the groups advocating nuclear freeze, the handicapped citizens group, and senior citizens. While the demands of this large cluster of groups were vague, most of the participants felt that the nature of all the social problems considered collectively warranted a loud voice to the nation to correct the inequities still present (Harden, 1983).

The March was structured as a two part rally (Official Celebration Program, 1983). The morning session ladened with entertainers was held at the base of the Washington Monument. The afternoon rally started after the processional from the monument down the mall along the reflection pool to the steps of the Lincoln Memorial. It was at this session that the major speakers were heard. While there was no one speaker who had the impact of Martin Luther King in 1963, the large audience did indeed get a sense of euphoric purpose in being there. The sub-theme of the March emerged as "No More Reagan in '84" (Barker & Perl, 1983). Coretta Scott King was the final speaker of the day. Completing her speech with the playing of King's "I Have a Dream" speech, Mrs. King ended the 1983 March by emphasizing the same inspiring message of the 1963 March. At 8:00 p.m., the mall was once again quiet; the second March that had been described as orderly, inspirational, and successful was over.

Rhetorical Amalgams

Andrews (1983) wrote that "a speech functions within a larger context and happens because of things that are happening in the world"

(p. 7). The historical approach to rhetorical criticism assumes a casual relation between events in history and public address (Brock & Scott, 1980). The Marches on Washington, D.C., both in 1963 and 1983 were products of the historical events preceding them. In the sixties, Blacks were subject to both physical and mental abuse as they attempted to secure their civil rights. In the eighties, governmental cuts in social programs, escalating unemployment, and fears of a nuclear war were the cause of widespread concern among many American citizens. The speeches presented on these two occasions were a part of the larger context. The Marches, which were the outgrowth of events threatening civil rights, economic security, and world peace, constituted a rhetorical event.

The historical perspectives preceding the Marches provide an essential basis for analysis. The Marches were complex events with many components that fit into a rhetorical scheme. The historical approach to rhetoric will be used to place the rhetorical amalgams in perspective to set the stage for the content analysis of the speeches. Rhetorical amalgams in this sense refer to the components of the events. The components to be considered in this section are the social context for the speeches, the setting (focusing on the surroundings and mood), the audience, and the speakers. The speeches will be considered through the process of content analysis in the major chapter of this study.

A brief recall of the historical perspectives for both Marches will serve to illumine the occasion for the mass protests. "Historical and political events or trends can force certain issues into our consciousness; the situation can make it imperative that we somehow come to grips with issues" (Andrews, 1983, p. 18). The issues for the 1963 March

stemmed from the growing public awareness of the violence against those citizens who were struggling for civil rights in employment, education, housing, voting, and use of public accommodations (Franklin, 1974). The Civil Rights Bill was pending in Congress and needed public support to give momentum to its passage. Non-violent peaceful demonstrations had resulted in minor legislative gains in various states, but more was needed to impact on national legislations. On August 28, 1963, the show of public support for civil rights was given by 200,000 Black and White American citizens who came to Washington, D.C. in a mass protest (Fishel & Quarles, 1976).

The original motivation for the 1983 March was to celebrate the Twentieth Anniversary of the 1963 March. The political and economic trends that were prevalent in the eighties, however, necessitated that the March do more than commemorate the 1963 March. Over 1,000 organizations and individuals joined the conveners in endorsing and supporting the 1983 March. The theme of the March, "We Still Have a Dream: Jobs, Peace, and Freedom" (Organizer's Manual, 1983) was an inclusive enough spectrum to enlist the diverse group of participants. The occasion of the 1983 March was to commemorate and recommit.

The geographical setting for both speeches, although twenty years apart was the same. They were outdoors on hot August days. The location was on the mall, flanking the reflection pool, between the Washington Monument and Lincoln Memorial in the nation's capital. The mood had changed as well as the thrust. In 1963, the mood was one of despair and hope (Staff, 1963b, September); despair over the incidents of racial violence and hope for a future of equality. In 1983, the mood

was purposefulness, intermingled with anger over the setbacks in political and economic gains. There was also an air of celebration of the dream that still lived (Dennis, 1983).

The audience composition had changed over the twenty year period. In 1963, the crowd of over 200,000 was predominantly Black with approximately thirty thousand White supporters and sympathizers. The crowd that came to Washington, D.C., in 1963 can be characterized as very courageous. At a time when police brutality through beatings, fire hosing, and guard dog attacks was a common occurrence, these men and women came to the capital despite their greatest fears. Even the journeys were plagued with the fears of attacks by the Klu Klux Klan or other vigilante groups as the buses and cars rolled through towns so imbedded with racism, that Blacks could not even use toilet facilities. Not only were the Blacks who came courageous, but the Whites were as well. They too were in physical danger if they supported the fight for civil rights (Blumberg, 1982; Franklin, 1974). Despite the threats and danger, the 1963 crowd assembled on the mall. Many people were attired as if going to church worship services, in suits and dresses, despite the sweltering heat. They were orderly and reverent as they heard one speaker after another, and were moved to tears when they heard the resonant voice of King share his dream and theirs for a better America. At the end of the day, they returned home as peacefully as they had come without any major incidents of disturbance.

The 250,000 to 300,000 that came to the 1983 March were a different group. Many of course had been at the 1963 March and had a historical background on what to expect (Bonner, 1983). Many were there who had not been born in 1963 or were too young to remember (Alexander, 1983).

This time, while the crowd was still predominantly Black there were more Whites; there were significant groups and organizations that were identifiable and not associated necessarily with Black civil rights. The processional from the Washington Monument to the Lincoln Memorial was designed to have the various groups organize behind color coordinated balloons and banners. The attire for this crowd was casual; sundresses, shorts, and jeans were the fashions of the day. The crowd was orderly and in good spirits with a strong sense of comradery. The Saturday afternoon picnic on the mall went well and the crowd in 1983 dispersed as peacefully as those did in 1963.

The speakers at both the 1963 and 1983 Marches shared in common the fact that they were all representatives or leaders of large groups. In 1963, the heads of the major Black organizations formed a coalition, which was later joined by labor and other non-Black religious groups. The speakers at this March were selected from that coalition.

Initially the program for the March allotted eight minutes to each speaker, so that no one would appear as more important than the other. There were three hours of speeches on that afternoon. Randolph, finally seeing his dream become a reality saw the March as a beginning, and stated that "wave after wave" would come back to Washington if immediate changes were not made; Reverend Eugene Carson Blake, Vice-Chairman of the National Council of Churches, indicted American Christians for coming late to the aid of Blacks and civil rights; Rabbi Joachim Prinz, President of the American Jewish Congress, felt that the basic problem is not evil, but silence and indifference, as it was with the downfall of Germany. Whitney Young, Roy Wilkins, and Walter Reuther all reflected on what was needed to guarantee the constitutional rights of all

Americans; John Lewis, Chairman of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, came armed with a prepared speech, which held that all politicians were low and despicable people and that none of them meant Blacks any good. He had intended to develop various points as he described the despair of Blacks; however, a White Archbishop objected and the leaders persuaded him to tone down the speech (Bennett, 1979).

No one who spoke that day, however, had the impact on the crowd that Martin Luther King, Jr., had when he appeared as the final speaker on the program. King had labored over this speech the night before to condense what he wanted to say into the allotted time period. Fauntroy advised him to let the Lord lead him. He began reading from a prepared text and then began to improvise and draw from a speech he had delivered in Detroit two months before on his dream of a free and just America (Oates, 1982; Bennett, 1979).

In August of 1983, the platform of speakers included over thirty men and women (Official Celebration Program, 1983). The program was structured in clusters reflecting the themes of jobs, peace, and freedom. There was no clear indication of how the speakers were assigned to the clusters. Other than identifying the speakers with the themes, it is difficult to offer a synopsis of there presentations. The Washington Post printed excerpts from the speeches of Harry Belafonte, entertainer; Benjamin Hooks, NAACP Director; Jessie Jackson, Operation Push; Coretta S. King, March Organizer; and Stevie Wonder, singer. Other speakers included the moderate and progressive civil rights leaders, such as Andrew Young, Atlanta Mayor; Norman Hill, A. Phillip Randolph Institute; Joseph Lowery, SCLC; James Farmer, former CORE leader; and John Lewis, Atlanta City Councilman. There was a diverse

block with Bella Abzug, Woman U.S.A.; Judy Goldsmith, National Organization for Women; Owen Beiber, United Auto Workers; Aubrey Lorde, gay and lesbian rights; and Cora Weiss, the Riverside Church Disarmament Program. The Black nationalists were represented by Louis Farrakan, Nation of Islam (Official Celebration Program, 1983).

The speakers in 1983 were allocated five minutes. The tone of the speeches can be described, in general, as anti-Reagan, with his defeat at the polls in 1984 being the political goal reflected by many of the speakers. The coalition of conscience was felt to be the needed unifying agent to activate the necessary political and economic changes. The call for action was prevalent in several speeches specifying the need for voter registration and participation. The speakers in 1983 advocated a change in the system and felt that everyone must participate in effecting that change. The marchers left the mall that day with a renewed spirit and a new feeling of power for a new generation of "Freedom Fighters" (Dennis, 1983).

The 1963 and 1983 Marches on Washington were carefully orchestrated events, designed to make a significant impact on needed political and economic changes. The speakers, speeches, and the audience were of rhetorical significance. The speeches associated with the March were significant in the sense that their collective rhetoric was designed either directly or indirectly, to effect changes in order to improve the living conditions of millions of citizens. The rhetorical amalgams discussed in this section had both a direct and indirect effect on the content of the speeches. This section serves to provided the context for the 1963 and 1983 speeches through its components.

Rationale and Limitations

Research from a rhetorical point of view has been scarce. The speeches of several speakers from the 1963 March have been reprinted in newsletters, biographies, and autobiographies, as well as in collections of famous speeches. However, with the exception of King's "I Have a Dream" speech, none have been analyzed, with the results published. As time continues, there appears to be a corresponding lack of rhetorical interest in the 1983 March. Currently, there has been no published research on the 1983 event, nor is it apparent that one speaker emerged as the voice of the March. The 1983 March has yet to receive its due attention in the rhetorical annals.

This study is intended to begin to rectify, at least partially, an apparent oversight by rhetorical researchers. Through the procedure of content analysis, the messages of selected speakers from each March will be analyzed and compared. It is anticipated that an investigation of both Marches as they relate to one another will serve to provide a different explanation and understanding of the meanings of the Marches, their similarities and differences. In 1988, on the occasion of the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the 1963 March, this rhetorical analysis will be useful in interpreting and appreciating the significance of the third March.

The focus of this study is on an objective analysis of the message. Only the selected messages will be analyzed inclusively. Other factors that may have had a direct or indirect bearing on the messages of the Marches have been treated within this chapter. These factors especially audience reaction, setting, historical perspective, and other rhetorical

considerations, should be regarded as the contextual structure for the content analysis of the speeches.

As a second limitation, this study is based on a sample of selected speakers that will be used to make inferences about the Marches as whole entities. Finally this study is based on transcribed speeches from various sources, thus not addressing elements of nonverbal communication, such as tonality, body movements, gestures, and paralanguage. The limitations of this study are a product of its design. The design of this research is such that both analysis and inferences will be related to the content of the messages.

This chapter has not only introduced the study, but has provided an overview of other factors relevant to holistic considerations, i.e., historical background and rhetorical amalgams. The remaining chapters will appear as follows: Chapter II will take an indepth survey of the relevant literature pertaining to the Marches, as well as the rhetorical and content analysis theories; Chapter III will detail the methodology; Chapter IV will discuss the findings of each of the four categories analyzed; and Chapter V will summarize the evolved comparisons of the features of the messages within the two Marches and provide guidelines for future research.

The findings of this research will constitute a beginning in the task of comparing for rhetorical purposes the 1963 and 1983 Marches on Washington. It is hoped that it will form the basis for comparative analysis of the rhetorical features of speeches presented in future Marches destined to occur in years to come.

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In the search for literature relevant to this research project, it was necessary to define working parameters. Given that the bases for this study were the 1963 and 1983 Marches, all research on one or the other or both is included to provide an understanding of the events. Research focusing on one speaker or speech, while of significant importance within itself, will be included when its contribution relates to one of the Marches as a whole. Studies on civil rights often include considerations of the Marches as moving forces and will be cited as supporting sources.

From the rhetorical standpoint, the framework of this research per se, has served as a guide to the selection of relevant studies. Included in this review are references to studies in Black and traditional rhetoric, criticism, conflict resolution, and other miscellaneous rhetorical topics. Applicable to content analysis are research studies in the social sciences particularly those defining category structure. The findings of the literature review are detailed in the subsequent sections of this chapter.

Marches on Washington

The 1963 March on Washington has been considered by numerous textbooks on civil rights (Blumberg, 1984), Black history (Bennett, 1979; Fishel & Quarles, 1976; Ploski & Kaiser, 1971), and Black leaders

(Anderson, 1973; Oates, 1982; Wilkins, 1982). These citings of the 1963 March, while very informative, have been brief, ranging from one or two paragraphs to several pages within a chapter. It is important to this research that these studies be reviewed because of their relevance to the March as a significant event. The historical background section in Chapter I serves to set the scene of the Marches; observations have been extracted from the various textbooks that included sections on the Marches. To further extend the review of Chapter I beyond the historical, this section also refers to studies that provide some analysis of the nature of the Marches in various respects.

Ploski and Kaiser (1971, p. 33) wrote that "the March represented the attempt of Negro leaders to dramatize to the nation at large the scope of the Negro discontent, and the enormous appeal which the idea of an open desegregated society had for millions of Americans." The March was a test for large scale non-violence, a strategy which in prior years prompted changes and reforms in small localized gains made toward desegregation. Blair (1977, p. 61) asked the question, "Was the March the beginning of a new era of imaginative interracial coalition politics, effective mass mobilization, and significant legislation? Or was it the final requiem for fifty years' of non-violent civil-rights activity?" He went on to summarize that the March had elements of King's conciliatory strategy and Lewis' radical operational theory.

The reactions to the 1963 March varied from seeing it as pressure to strengthen the civil rights bill (Flemming, 1966) to characterizing it as the peak of the civil rights movement (Blumberg, 1984). Rustin (1963) saw it as being too successful, inviting counterrevolutionaries to strike back with bombings, specifically in Birmingham. He also saw

the success of the March as putting the Kennedy Administration on the spot to take some action in a signficant manner. Lewis (1963) saw the March as a serious revolution. The two most extensive reports on the March came from Bennett, (1963) and the staff of Ebony magazine, who viewed the March as the biggest protest ever, and New South (1963) which devoted its entire September issue to the March.

The November, 1963 article in Ebony detailed all aspects of the 1963 March. Pictorial entries depicted the size and dress of the crowd, the speakers, and celebrities, the modes of transportation, and numerous other features of that day. The writers covered the days immediately prior to the March, the journeys of the participations and incidents along the way, the celebrities in attendance, and statements from selected speakers. Particular attention was given to the singing of Mahalia Jackson and the speeches of Lewis and King.

The September, 1963 issue of New South sketched a thorough scenario of the March. Starting with the press conference held by the leaders the day before, the staff covered all aspects. Beginning with the arrival of the marchers at 1 a.m. through sunup, and preceeding the morning program, the writers documented the happenings. Their coverage of the afternoon rally was one of the few reports, if not the only one, that quoted all of the major speakers and referred to entertainers and supporting persons. Articles in The Washington Post depicted the March in detail with essays on the journey of the participants (Aarons, 1963, p. D15), the focus of the March, crowd description (Baker, 1963b, p. A1, A12), and excerpts from the speeches (p. H14). The staff of the SCLC September Newsletter described the March as a dream spun from the reference point of a co-organizer and the Dellinger (1963b) and Lewis

(1963) reviewed the march in the Liberation's "Seeds for Liberation" section.

President Kennedy described the March as an event of which America could "properly be proud" (Quarles, 1969 p. 265). Quarles went on to say that "these speakers conveyed a common note of urgency, as if to underscore the word 'now' which appeared on hundreds of placards" (p. 265). The speakers he said "transmitted something of their own fervor and determination, they also struck a broadly patriotic note, for in their thinking the March was a reaffirmation of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence" (p. 265). All sources that provided coverage of the 1963 March were unanimous in the praise of its success.

The greatest coverage of the 1983 March thusfar has been provided by The Washington Post. The Washington news service articles were both extensive and interpretive. One article reviewed the ouster of the President as the unifying theme (Barker & Perl, 1983, p. A18). Harden (1983, p. A1, A18) detailed the composition of the new coalition. Milloy (1983, p. A1, A19) described the experience of being present at the March and what it was like to interface with the crowd. A descriptive analysis was written on the crowd (Burgess & Gregg, 1983, p. A19, A20), and the trip to the March by bus (White, 1983, p. A21). The Cable News Network provided a live broadcast of the event with commentary and reflections on the 1963 March. Under the heading of culture and consciousness, Dennis (1983, p. 35-37) reflected on the March in contrast to that of 1963.

Research beyond descriptive writing for the 1983 March has been limited. Marable (1983) made a political assessment of the anniversary March. In this article, the author viewed the 1983 March as a result of

three factors, U.S. capitalist economic systems, Reaganism, and the rise of the New Right politics (p. 3-4). "For all its shortcomings, however, the March proved to be a qualitative advance over the 1963 effort; and attainment of a level of grassroots mobilization on par with Randolph's earlier campaign" (Marable, 1983, p. 18). This was the first assessment of the March. Yette and Yette (1984) in their book compared the two Marches from a unique viewpoint. He too saw them from a political standpoint and went a step further to summarize that the Marches provided a springboard into foreign politics and affairs for several Black leaders. Yette and Yette (1984, inside cover) described their book as a "commemorative pictorial" in which he further states that "this is the first journalistic proclamation of the Third Revolution--the near phenomenal transformation of the nation's Black leadership into national leadership and international influence." Outside of the descriptive analysis of the print media and the few articles mentioned in this section, there was little reaction on the 1983 March.

The research on the speeches in both Marches has been extremely limited. Of the 1963 speeches, with the exception of King's "I Have a Dream" speech, none have been analyzed. Some of the texts have been reprinted (Foner, 1972) from the 1963 March, but as of the time of this writing there have been no reprints of the texts from any of the speakers in 1983. There were excerpts from several of the speechesin the Washington Post both in 1963 and 1983. A search through the journals in the area of communication studies for essays on any aspects of the Marches and on speakers in particular was a disappointment. Bosmajian (1982) looked at the inaccuracies in the reprinting of the "I Have a Dream" speech. Dissertation Abstracts International, echoed the

lack of research on the speeches and Marches from the perspective of communication studies. There were some articles in the areas of journalism, sociology, and political science which mentioned the Marches in light of civil rights legislation and concerns. One seemingly relevant work in communication was done by Payne (1973) who used the ten psycholinguistic scales (Gottschalk & Gleser, 1969) to apply a content analysis to the speeches and written documents of six Black leaders. This study is applicable to a computer program, and not replicable within the context of this research. Beyond these studies there is scant research on the Marches.

Rhetorical and Content Analysis Studies

The Marches are viewed as rhetorical events to be analyzed through a discrete component, the speeches. "The text of a speech is an organic whole. It lives because its parts function together" (Andrews, 1983, p. 49). The Marches are organic wholes and the speeches are their functioning parts. Andrews felt that to understand the speech "the critic begins by systematically taking apart the text through orderly analysis" (p. 49). Through the method of content analysis the texts of the speeches will be systematically taken apart to explain the Marches.

The concept of content analysis has been developed over many years. Berleson (1952, p. 18) defined it as "a research technique for the objective, systematic, and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication." Holsti (1969) referred to content analysis as any technique for making inferences by objectively and systematically identifying specified characteristics of messages. Holsti (1969) went one step further in identifying the seven purposes of content analysis,

some of which are relevant to this research. The purpose of content analysis applicable to this study is to describe trends in communication content if any exist among the speakers of the Marches, and to analyze the techniques of persuasion evident in the action and appeals categories.

Particular interest has been given to the development of categorical units in content analysis. Holsti (1969, p. 95) felt that categories should reflect the purpose of the research, and be exhaustive, mutually exclusive, and independent. Independent in this sense means that the value of one category does not determine the value of another category. The categories in this study were developed to meet this criterion.

The selection of the sample of documents is also an important aspect. Berleson (1952) felt that a small carefully chosen sample of relevant content will produce just as valid a result as the analysis of a great amount. Entire speeches were selected as the samples for the Marches, half of these being selected by the process of random sampling and the other by the process of purposive sampling which yields a sample selected to meet the needs of the study (Bailey, 1982). Danielson and Mullen (Budd et al., 1967) provide the basic guidelines for the recording unit, which they called the basic space unit (BSU). The basic space unit had to meet certain requirements: (1) it had to be large enough to yield meaning; (2) it had to be small enough not to contain too many messages; (3) it had to be easily identifiable; and, (4) the total number of units in the issues to be sampled had to be easily ascertainable for sampling purposes. The sentence has often been used as a basic space or recording unit. "Choice of categories does not generally

determine the appropriate recording unit (also called unit of analysis). That is, for a given set of documents and a given set of categories, there is no one single recording unit" (Bailey, 1982, p. 317). Holsti (1969) listed five recording units: (1) single word, (2) theme, (3) the character, (4) the sentence or paragraph, and (5) the item. The word and theme are too limited because they omit the relative context of the statements; the character is not applicable because the speeches do not focus on a person; and the item (speech) and paragraph are too broad and omit the specifics within single statements. Therefore, the sentence or focused statements within complex sentences will be used as the recording unit. Through the use of the sentence one can accommodate the designated categories.

Content analysis had reached its height of popularity in the late sixties and early seventies in this country. Stone, (Krippendorf, 1980, p. 125) best exemplified the popular approach in the "General Inquirer" which was a computer package. The "General Inquirer" was used quite extensively especially in journalistic studies that analyzed the content of newspapers. Payne (1973) used this method to perform content analysis on selected speakers using the psycholinguistic scales of Gottschalk and Gleser (1969). It was the initial intention of the researcher to use this method; however, it is no longer accessible through the State of Florida computer system.

The content analytical approach of this research will look at the relative frequency of occurrence of the defined categorical units. Categories are developed "only by letting the categories emerge from the documents to be analyzed" (Bailey, 1982, p. 316). Letting the categories emerge from the speeches and their context allows the goals of

mutual exclusiveness and exhaustiveness to be met. The categories (defined in Chapter IV) that emerged from the document initially were those of time and goals. The time category was developed because the Marches were in two different periods of time and were the outgrowths of discontent with the hope for a better future. The goals category resulted from the themes set forth in the 1983 March agenda (Organizer's Manual, 1983).

The categories of action and appeals are based on rhetorical theories and studies citied in the following paragraphs. In the seventies many studies were completed which related to Black rhetoric and Black speakers. A common theme among these writers of rhetoric was racial conflict (Himes, 1973) and the methods used to resolve the problems. Many of the Black speakers emerged to take different positions on conflict resolution. "Marcus Garvey established Black nationalism and withdrawal as major conflict strategies in the Black community" (p. 32). He called on Black men to forget equality in America and to seek freedom on the continent of Africa (Smith, 1969, p. 38). Wallace D. Ford, claiming to be a prophet in 1930, called for Black separatism; unlike Garvey, he felt that Blacks should have a part of America. The Nation of Islam a Black Muslim religious sect, evolved from Ford's movement. Elijah Mohammed, a later leader of the Black Muslims, felt that separatism was a primary goal as did Malcom X (Blair, 1977).

Those Black leaders who did not advocate separation emerged as assimilationists. Pinkney (1975) and Geschwender (1978) devoted an entire chapter to the process of Blacks assimilating into the American culture. Many of the organizers of the 1963 March were said to be of

this school of thought. The method used by this group was non-violent direct action (Himes, 1973) with King its chief proponent. King's movement had been based on the belief in the goodness of man and that America had the moral courage to correct the injustices. It was those ideals and needs for national concern that defined the magnitude of the problem. That insight opened the doors for more expedient and radical means of persuasion.

Emergence of the assimilationist means of non-violent persuasion gave full vent to the revolutionary strategies of conflict resolution. Revolutionary rhetoric which advocated immediate and complete change of the system was not new when it emerged to the forefront in the late sixties. What was new was the utilization of the term Black power and the demand for changes rather than request (Smith, 1969). The combination of the words Black power was offensive to White America and implied Black supremacy, reverse racism, and Black violence (Pinkney, 1975).

Arthur Smith (1972) wrote that "the contemporary rhetor of Black revolutions suggests that morality might be encouraged by the wielding of power by Blacks" (p. 218). "Although the use of the power theme in speeches and essays suggests an inward turn (the Black man turning to his own potentials and abilities), the concept is militant to the extent that the acquisition of power always presupposes the relinquishing of power by another" (p. 319). Another major theme according to Smith is "American's hypocrisy." Hypocrisy used in this sense is the holding up of Democracy and the American ideal as an example to the world while denying this same opportunity to its own people. Other themes of the revolution rhetoric is a common enemy, and conspiracy. The common enemy

is defined as the White supremacist who conspire to keep Blacks from full participation in this society.

Golden and Rieke (1971) in their textbook brought the categories of assimilation, separation, and revolution together under the heading of Black rhetoric. In their scheme of rhetorical strategies (p. 41), assimilationists see the path to the good life through a society for all people; separationists see the path to the good life as leading to a society of Black people free from White association; and revolutionist see the path to the good life only through the creation of a new society. Good life is defined as the goal and is equated with freedom, humanity, and identity. Golden and Rieke classified and analyzed numerous speeches by Black Americans under the three persuasive categories. Relevant to this research study is the analysis of King's "I Have a Dream" speech under the category of assimilation.

The actions advocated by Black rhetoricans can incorporate one of three persuasive appeals to express their position. The appeals are emotional, logical and ethical. Since classical times these appeals have been regarded as a viable classification of persuasion and argument in the area of communication studies. The explanation by Thonssen et al. (1970), of the three appeals in their section on the standards of judgment, serves as the basis for this category. The chapter on logical judgment, entitled "The Integrity of Ideas," discusses logical proof as ideally achieving truth as the final desideratum. Logic can follow from reasoning either deductive or inductive and is the product of rational thinking. The emotional mode elicits feelings and is the basis for beliefs or actions resulting from need or desire. The ethical in its simplest form deals with that which is regarded as good or bad, right or

wrong. In this case one is confronted with values of the culture. Numerous other studies have attempted to deal with one or two of the appeals. The most extensive research has been in the area of ethos. Several studies have attempted to develop scales of measurement for this form of appeal (McCroskey, 1966 and Baudheim & Davis, 1972). Becker (1963) studied the areas of emotional and logical appeals to determine their effects on persuasion. Rosenthal (1966) sought to explain ethos in the persuasive process. His theory was based on the concept of ethos as a distinct type of persuasion either personal or non-personal depending on the agent of value whether it is the speaker or message. It is well to note that articles incorporating all three appeals were not readily available.

Research Questions

The research and literature on content analysis are in agreement that it is a systematic methodology that allows for the objective processing of data (Krippendorf, 1980). Holsti felt tht content analysis is only limited by the creativity of the researcher (Bailey, 1982). It was for its objective quality that it was selected for use in this study. The content analytical approach will look at the frequency of occurrence of the four defined categorical units of time, goals, actions, and appeals. Using the categories for a guideline the following research questions have been formulated for this study in an effort to determine the differences in the two Marches:

1. Did the 1963 selected speakers from the March on Washington have a greater emphasis on time, than the 1983 selected March on Washington speakers? If so, what was the time frame

reference receiving the greatest emphasis past, present or future? Was the time reference emphasis positive or negative?

2. Did the 1963 selected speakers from the March on Washington give greater emphasis to the goals of jobs, peace, and freedom than the 1983 selected speakers? If so, which goal received the greatest emphasis? Was the goal emphasized more positively or negatively?
3. Did the 1963 selected speakers from the March on Washington advocate the action of assimilation, separation or revolution more than the 1983 selected speakers? If so, which action was advocated more so than the others? Was the advocation for or against the use of the action?
4. Did the 1963 selected speakers from the March on Washington utilize a greater percentage of rhetorical appeals than the 1983 selected speakers? If so, which appeal received the greatest emphasis? Was the appeal used more positively or negatively?

Answers to the above questions should reveal an objective comparison of the essence of the speeches in 1963 and 1983 Marches on Washington. The ultimate question that will be answered indirectly from this body of research will be whether the 1983 March conveyed the same message overall that the 1963 March conveyed. Can we surmise from the results of this study that things had not changed significantly over a twenty year period? The procedure used to answer these questions is detailed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

This research on the two Marches on Washington is descriptive in structure. It is intended to compare the content of selected speeches, to determine if the rhetoric changed over the twenty year period that lapsed between Marches. Specifically, the differences and similarities will be analyzed to determine, if there has been a significance in the directional tone of the speakers on time reference, goals, actions, and appeals. This study represents the first comparison of speeches from the Marches using the tool of content analysis.

Sampling Procedure

The 1963 March on Washington hosted eleven speakers, representing the sponsoring organizations and several entertainers (Bennett, 1963). The speakers were all male, 8 Black and 3 White. In 1983 there was a total of more than 45 speakers and entertainers at the afternoon rally alone (Official Celebration Program, 1983). The speaking group was composed of 17 Black males, 11 White males, Hispanic male, American Indian male, 7 Black females, and 7 White females. In addition the entertainers added to both the total number of participants and the diversity in racial and ethnic backgrounds.

Given the changes in the composite groups of speakers from 1963 to 1983, it was of extreme importance to obtain a representative sample of speakers from both groups. The design of this research is mixed, using both between-subject and within-subject design (Ventry and Schiavetti,

1980) which looks at the differences between the two groups, and the inner differences; in this particular case the 1963 and 1983 selected speakers, comprised groups A and B. There are several possible methods that could be utilized in the selection of the speakers depending on the type of groupings desired. To obtain a balance in the type of speakers a four group design was created. For each March there will be two groups of three speakers for a total of twelve speakers.

Group A for 1963 and 1983 will be composed of the representatives from the three largest Black organizations which supported and participated in the Marches (Table 3.1). These organizations are nationally known and have a documented track record in their support of the civil rights movement.

Table 3.1
Group A Speakers

Year	Speaker	Organization
1963	Martin Luther King, Jr.	Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC)
	Roy Wilkins	National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)
	Whitney Young	National Urban League
1983	Benjamin Hooks	National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)
	Jessie Jackson	Congress of Racial Equality (CORE)
	Joseph Lowery	Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC)

All of the representatives included in both A groups were Black males between the ages of 30 and 65 and were at the times of the Marches the heads of the organizations which they represented.

Group B serves as a balance to insure that a representative sample of speakers were selected. This was done by the sampling procedure of randomization, using a table of random numbers (Agresti & Agresti, 1979). After the first three speakers were selected from each group the remaining speakers were numbered in the order in which they either spoke or were listed. The 1963 speakers were assigned numbers from the order in which they spoke on the audio tape obtained from the Martin Luther King Center. The 1983 speakers were assigned numbers from the order in which they were listed on the official program printed in the August 27, 1983, edition of the Washington Post. Entertainers and emcees were eliminated from the 1983 list prior to assigning numbers. As a result of the randomization process the speakers listed in Table 3.2 were selected.

Table 3.2
Group B Speakers

Year	Speaker	Organization
1963	Eugene C. Blake	National Council of Churches
	John Lewis	Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC)
	Walter Reuther	United Auto Workers
1983	Myrlie Evers	Civil Rights Advocate
	Randall Forsberg	The Institute of Defense and Disarmament Studies
	Addie Wyatt	United Food and Commercial Workers Union

Group B is a diverse group of speakers which signifies the representation of the additional interest groups of both Marches. From 1963 the speakers are representative of student, religious, and labor organizations. In 1983, the speakers are all women and represent the three

themes of jobs, with Addie Wyatt, a union representative, peace, with Randall Forsberg from the fight for nuclear disarmament, and freedom, with Myrlie Evers, widow of the slain sixties civil rights leader Medgar Evers. The racial composition also added some balance to the 1963 group, with two White males and one Black male. In 1983 the group consisted of one White female, and two Black females. The speakers in both A and B groups are listed in alphabetical order within their respective groups for coding purposes.

In Table 3.3 a listing of the twelve speakers is given with their identification numbers. The capital letter A or B will signify the designated group. The number 1, 2, or 3 will indicate the order in which they are analyzed. The number 63 or 83 will follow to show which March the speaker participated in. An example is B2-83, this person is the second speaker to be analyzed from the randomly selected group in 1983 and is Randall Forsberg.

Data Collection

The actual instruments to be measured were the transcribed texts of the speeches. While the researcher was present at the 1983 March with a tape recorder, those tapes were not inclusive of all the speeches to be analyzed and had extensive crowd noise in the background which severely impaired the quality of the sound. It was therefore necessary to rely on other recordings.

Table 3.3
Listing of Speaker Identification Numbers

	Id. Numbers	Speaker
1963 March	A1-63	Martin Luther King, Jr.
	A2-63	Roy Wilkins
	A3-63	Whitney Young
	B1-63	Eugene Carson Blake
	B2-63	John Lewis
	B3-63	Walter Reuther
1983 March	A1-83	Benjamin Hooks
	A2-83	Jessie Jackson
	A3-83	Joseph Lowery
	B1-83	Myrlie Evers
	B2-83	Randall Forsberg
	B3-83	Addie Wyatt

The speeches selected from the 1983 March were transcribed from two sources. The first source was a video recording of the Cable Network News (CNN) direct broadcast.[1] This source had cuts in the middle of some speeches and the omission of others in whole or part. The second source was audio tapes produced by the International Communication Services.[2] There were problems with the quality of these tapes, including excessive noise pollution, omissions, and untimely fadeouts. Therefore, the speeches relevant to this research were obtained through the combined use of both sources for the 1983 March on Washington. The speeches for the 1963 March were transcribed from a tape that included all the speeches, purchased from the Martin Luther King, Center for Non-Violent Social Change, in Atlanta, Georgia.[3]

The speeches were first transcribed by an independent transcriber from the audio tapes. After the transcripts were completed, they were proofread while listening to either the audio or video tape and in some instances both when it was apparent one or the other had omissions of content. This was done to insure as close to accurate account of the actual speeches.[4]

Category and Unit Determination

In his book on content analysis Holsti (1969) stated that categories should reflect the purposes of the research, and be exhaustive, mutually exclusive, and independent. In this sense independent means that one category does not determine the value of another category. In selecting categories for this study the purpose foremost in mind was to ascertain if there was a difference in the messages of the Marches in the twenty year time frame.

Given that there was indeed a time period of twenty years and that a speech has been said to be indicative of its time (Andrews, 1983), it seems logical to develop some sort of determinant of time reference. As a result the first category emerged as time orientation. The time orientation category was developed to determine if it could be surmised that the focus of the sum of given speeches was predominantly in the past, present or future.

The next obvious pattern that emerged was from the thematic concept. Each March had been organized on the basis of a specific agenda. In 1963, it was jobs and freedom, and in 1983, it was jobs, peace, and freedom. In order to develop an inclusive category the themes from the 1983 March were used to formulate a category entitled goal orientations.

It was felt that although the peace theme was not stated in the written agenda in 1963, it was indeed a major issue. For in 1963 the peace of the nation was threatened from within as evident by the many instances of violence throughout, and from outside with the pending involvement in the Viet Nam War (Franklin, 1974). The goal orientation category was designed to determine if in fact one of the three prescribed themes had a greater impact or cause for concern than the other two.

The next step in the development of the categories to be analyzed was derived from the question of how would we obtain the goals on the agenda. What action is needed, became the question. As a result, an action orientation category was contrived. What explicit actions should one look for in this type of situation? The answer came from Golden and Rieke (1971) who summarized Black rhetoric as advocating three types of conflict resolutions. Thus, their three methods common to Black rhetoric became the divisions of the action orientation category. Assimilation, separation, and revolution, were the options, and the question emerged as whether one of these actions was favored over the other to resolve the conflicts in the quests for jobs, peace, and freedom.

The fourth and final category emerged from the how question. The how in this sense refers to how did the speakers advocate the actions to achieve the goals. As a result, the question evolved into what type of appeal was used. The appeals orientation has its base in the more traditional rhetorical structure. The components of this category are logical, ethical, and emotional appeals (Thonssen et al., 1970). The question of what type of appeal was used, goes one step further to determine the extent one appeal was utilized either more than or in lieu of the others.

The four categories, while there are unifying connections are indeed mutually exclusive. It is felt that they are broad enough to encompass the whole essence of the selected speeches. Any additional categories would possibly provide some redundancy, because the categories developed, answered the basic questions of what, why, when, and how.

The unit of analysis or recording unit was initially to be the sentence. However, to use the sentence provided some problems when they were complex or compound. Many of the speeches contained very verbose sentences. As a result, one sentence could have as many as three referents in one category. For example in Jessie Jackson's speech "Twenty years later the power of his dream has drawn this generation together, and inspires us to keep on dreaming." In the category of time there are two distinct referents in this one complex sentence. Therefore, it was decided that the statement or clause would be the recording unit. The statement or clause for this research is defined as a group of related words that contains both a subject and a predicate that makes a single declaration.

The speech text to be analyzed varied in length from approximately four to eleven typed pages. As a result it was necessary to develop a unit of standardization. The total number of words in a given speech was the adopted unit for standardization. The use of a word count versus other units allowed for a more simplistic and reliable replication of the unit standardization process.

To count the words in the speeches there were several rules that were followed. First, every word was counted, regardless of whether it was used once or fifty times throughout the speech. Contractions such

as "don't," which is "do not," and "we've," rather than "we have," were counted as two words. Compound words were also counted as two words, using as a rule that each word should be able to stand alone, examples are "sometime" equivalent to "some and time," and "whiteface" equivalent to "white and face." Following this same guideline, prefixed and suffixed words were counted as one word because at least one of the parts could not stand alone, for example "unbelief" and "hopelessness." Neither "un" nor "ness" can stand as a word when set apart. Acronyms such as NAACP or UF were counted as one word no matter how many words composed the representative components. Proper names and titles were counted in their entirety, for example Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., counted as five, Daddy King as two and M.L. King as three. Numbers were counted as one word because whether they are spelled out is a decision of the transcriber, for example "three million," "3 million" and "3,000,000" will be regarded as one word, also "11,963" and "eleven thousand nine hundred and sixty three" equal one word. "Fifty three percent" or "53%" on the other hand will equal two, one for the number and one for the descriptive term of percent. The total number of words were used as the base factor, counted according to the above mentioned rules; they were the determinants of the statistical ratio of statements per number of words.

Research Design, Statistical Test, and Procedure

The first step in the procedure to perform a content analysis was the determination of the categories and recording units. Once they were defined, the working transcripts of the speeches were distributed to the

initial coder (researcher) and the check coder for independent coding of the four categories.[5]

Prior to the initial coding the words in each speech were counted using the rules outlined earlier in this chapter. All speeches were counted at least twice to obtain the total number of words. After the word count each coder used the category definitions to begin the procedure.

In order to clearly distinguish the categories colored pens were used for each coding. The time orientation category was coded first in red. Each speech was reviewed to select the statements referring to time. Second the determination was made as to whether it was past, present or future. Finally, the determination was made as to whether the statement was positive or negative. The same process was repeated on the other three categories individually. The color coding was as follows: the goal orientation category in green; the appeals category in blue; and the action category in black. It is a must that each category be coded independent of the other regardless of whether the statement is contained in the same sentence or not.

The check-coding system was used to insure a significant amount of reliability in the research. In the check-coding system a second coder is instructed to follow the same coding procedures independently. After all of the categories were coded the initial rate of inter-coder agreement was calculated by comparing the total number of statements from both the initial coder and the check coder. The second level of interrater reliability was obtained through the comparison of coded statements for agreement. After the scores of interrater reliability were ascertained, both coders met to decide upon the final set of coded

speeches which resulted from the agreement between coders. The Agreed-Upon-Transcripts should provide a highly reliable document to be analyzed for differences.

The research design for this study is a three factor mixed design. In this design two separate groups are given scores on the three items in two directional areas. The category orientation model Table 3.4 is the tables used for all of the four orientations to be analyzed with the changes according to the specific category being analyzed.

Table 3.4
Category Orientation Model

Speaker	Positive			Negative		
	Code 1	Code 2	Code 3	Code 1	Code 2	Code 3
1-63 thru 6-83						

The code blocks will be replaced with the category orientation. For example in the time orientation, Code 1 will be past, Code 2 will be present, and Code 3 will be future. There will be a score in each of the six code areas for the twelve speakers for a total of thirty six in each group.

The goal of this research is to answer the null hypothesis that there was no difference in the composition of the speeches in 1963 and 1983. To test this hypothesis a four way analysis of variance was used as the statistical test. This statistic is used to test for differences among groups that rise from the cross classification of two or more categorical variables.

The initial analysis of variance will seek to find interaction between the four variables. The first variable will be the year 1963

versus 1983. The second variable will be visibility of the groups, A versus B. The third variable will be the valence positive versus negative. The final variable will be the repeated measures pertinent to the category orientation. Time repeated measures will equal, past, present, and future; goals will equal, jobs, peace, and freedom; actions will equal, assimilation, separation, and revolution; and appeals will equal, logical, ethical, and emotional.

The following chapter will detail in separate sections the levels of interrated reliability and the results of the analysis of variance test for interaction.

Notes

[1]The CNN (Atlanta, Georgia) broadcast video tape was available for purchase at a cost exceeding $300.00 at the time of data collection (Fall, 1983).

[2]The International Communication Services Company, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, is no longer in operation.

[3]This tape was arranged by special contract through SCLC in 1963. Copies were available from the King Center at a cost of $10.00 at the time of this research (Fall, 1983). There is also an album with some of the speeches available through Motown Records.

[4]All transcripts used are available from the researcher.

[5]The initial coder and check coder were from different cultural backgrounds (one Black American and one White American). This provided a counterbalance in the agreed upon text where the differences may have been interpreted from a cultural perspective, thus eliminating that aspect of bias.

CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Analysis of Time Orientation Design

The first of the four categories for content analysis is that of time. Time as defined by Webster is the measured or measurable period, during which an action, process, or condition exists or continues. In this research time will more specifically reflect past, present or future.

Coding Definition

Any phrase, short sentence, and/or statements in this category will include those referring to the past, present or future. Further defined, past denotes events or conditions a year or more prior to the March; present will refer to events or conditions the three to six month span prior to the March, and the actual time of the March; and future refers to the events or conditions visualized after the March. The past, present, and future basic recording units once identified will them be recorded into positive and negative groupings. Positive is defined in this sense as the influence for good. Negative is defined as that which is adverse or bad.

There are a total of six classification groups in the time category: (1) past positive (pp); (2) present positive (prp); (3) future positive (fp); (4) past negative (pn); (5) present negative (prn); and (6) future negative (fn). Each March grouping has a total of 36 scores to be coded.

Agreement/Reliability

Reliability data require that at least two coders independently describe a possibly large set of recording units in terms of a common data language. These terms may be descriptive categories, numerical values of a variable, or complex classification schemes (Krippendorf, 1980, p. 133). The following sections describe the process for obtaining first the reliability on the total number of statements, and second, the reliability for agreement on the statements coded.

Each of the twelve speeches were coded separately by two individual raters using the specific category coding definition as the guideline. The initial percentage of interrater agreement was obtained by comparing the total number of statements coded for each March, cross classified by positive and negative valence. The initial rate of agreement between the coders for the total number of statements in the time category was, for 1963, 78 percent, and for 1983, 81 percent.

In determining the level of agreement on the statements coded, a sample was taken by rotating the speeches in the order listed in Chapter III. The initial rater's first coded speech was searched for a statement referring to past, the statement was then found in the co-rater's coded speech and a determination was made as to whether they were coded the same. This process was repeated until a total of five past statements were checked and compared for agreement. After the completion of the past statements, present, future, positive and negative were checked for agreement reviewing five statements for each category for a total of twenty-five statements (see Appendix A for examples). The results of the degree of agreement on the coding of time statements were past, 100

percent; present, 100 percent; future, 80 percent; positive, 100 percent; and negative, 100 percent. After the percent of the interrater reliability was determined on the total statements, and the coding, an agreed upon coded transcript was prepared for each speech.

Statistical Analysis

To obtain the Agreed-Upon-Transcripts the speeches were reviewed by both raters simultaneously. A determination was made at this time as to which statements to definitely include in the time category; whether the statements were first, past, present, or future; and second, if the statements were positive or negative. The results of the Agreed-Upon-Transcripts are listed in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1
Scores for Time Category

Speakers	Positive			Negative		
	Past	Present	Future	Past	Present	Future
A1-63	4	18	17	0	14	3
A2-63	1	8	0	3	1	1
A3-63	0	5	2	2	7	1
B1-63	2	5	0	0	3	0
B2-63	0	2	2	1	6	4
B3-63	0	7	1	1	0	3
A1-83	4	5	2	0	4	3
A2-83	4	16	4	6	11	1
A3-83	3	2	3	2	3	0
B1-83	5	4	3	4	1	0
B2-83	0	2	3	0	2	4
B3-83	2	2	3	1	1	0

The standardized scores for the speeches in the (time) category were obtained by dividing the total number of statements per category by the total number of words (Appendix B) in each speech. The resulting

means are based on the average rate for that group multiplied by 1,000. (See Table 4.2.)

Table 4.2
Summary of Means: Time Category

Group	Positive			Negative		
	Past	Present	Future	Past	Present	Future
A1-63	1.4	8.3	5.2	2.5	7.7	1.7
B1-63	1.3	7.8	1.4	1.0	4.7	3.3
A1-83	3.0	5.6	2.5	2.0	4.6	1.0
B1-83	4.3	4.7	5.1	3.1	2.2	2.0

To determine if there was a difference in the means of the number of statements coded for the groups of speakers by their visibility, the valence on the three categories of past, present, and future, a four way analysis was performed. The ANOVA was applied to scores in Table 4.2. The results of the ANOVA (summarized in Table 4.3) were that a significant difference was found in the categorical variable of time at the 0.001 alpha level.

Furthermore, the results of the interaction analysis was that there was a difference in the percentage of statements allocated to past, present or future regardless of the group, the year or the valence. There was a higher percentage of statements allocated to the present by all speakers.

Analysis of Goal Design

Goal is defined as the three ideals set forth in the written agendas of the Marches. The ideals are taken from the 1983 March which

includes the two themes of the 1963 March. In this section goals will be more specifically jobs, peace, and freedom.

Table 4.3
Summary of Four Way ANOVA: Time Category

Source	DF	ANOVA SS	F-Value	Probability
Visibility	1	0.00000253	0.26	0.6115
Year	1	0.00000467	0.48	0.4909
Visibility X Year	1	0.00001281	1.32	0.2558
Valence	1	0.00002703	2.79	0.1013
Visibility X Valence	1	0.00000047	0.05	0.8275
Year X Valence	1	0.00000413	0.43	0.5167
Visibility X Year X Valence	1	0.00000284	0.29	0.5909
Time	2	0.00016002	8.26	0.0008***
Visibility X Time	2	0.00001618	0.84	0.4401
Year X Time	2	0.00005974	3.08	0.0550
Visibility X Year X Time	2	0.00000591	0.31	0.7385
Valence X Time	2	0.00000702	0.36	0.6978
Visibility X Valence X Time	2	0.00001196	0.62	0.5437
Year X Valence X Time	2	0.00000234	0.12	0.8863
Visibility X Year X Valence X Time	2	0.00001675	0.86	0.4276

*** = $P \leq .001$; ** = $P \leq .01$; * = $P \leq .05$

Coding Definition

Any phrases, short sentences, and/or statements in this category will be those that refer to the themes of the Marches, jobs, peace, and freedom. Any statement including these themes, their synonyms, or references to them in any clearly distinguishable manner will be coded and included. Each identified statement will then be recorded into a positive or negative grouping (See Appendix A for examples).

There are a total of six classifications in the goal category: (1) positive statements on jobs (jp); (2) positive statements on peace (pep); (3) positive statements on freedom (frp); (4) negative statements on jobs (jn); (5) negative statements on peace (pen); and (6) negative statements on freedom (frn). Each March group has a total of 36 scores to be coded.

Agreement/Reliability

The same procedures to obtain interrater agreement was used for each of the categories. The initial rate of agreement for the total number of statements in the goals category was, 87 percent for 1963; and 91 percent for 1983. The results of the degree of agreement on the coding of the goals statements were jobs, 100 percent; peace, 100 percent; freedom, 100 percent, positive, 100 percent; and negative, 80 percent.

Statistical Analysis

The results of the Agreed-Upon-Transcripts for the category of goals are listed in Table 4.4. The means for the groups are displayed on Table 4.5.

Table 4.4
Scores for Goal Category

Speakers	Positive			Negative		
	Jobs	Peace	Freedom	Jobs	Peace	Freedom
A1-63	0	2	25	1	4	8
A2-63	2	0	5	0	3	0
A3-63	1	0	2	1	1	1
B1-63	1	0	4	1	2	2
B2-63	4	0	5	2	5	2
B3-63	5	1	5	2	1	4
A1-83	10	6	1	18	0	1
A2-83	2	4	3	3	2	3
A3-83	1	1	3	1	1	2
B1-83	1	1	15	0	0	1
B2-83	1	4	2	3	8	0
B3-83	6	6	22	1	0	0

Table 4.5
Summary of Means Goal Category

Group	Positive			Negative		
	Jobs	Peace	Freedom	Jobs	Peace	Freedom
A1-63	1.5	0.5	9.3	0.8	2.9	2.5
B1-63	5.0	0.5	7.5	2.6	4.1	4.3
A1-83	3.5	2.8	2.0	5.8	0.8	1.6
B1-83	4.5	6.0	22.9	2.1	4.0	0.6

To determine if there was a difference in the means of the number of statements coded for goals across the variables, a four way analysis of variance was performed on the data in Table 4.5. The results of the ANOVA (summarized in Table 4.6) were that a significant difference was evident in several variables at a .05 alpha level as well as in their interaction.

Table 4.6
Summary of Four Way Anova: Goal Category

Source	DF	ANOVA SS	F-Value	Probability
Visibility	1	0.00011429	4.82	0.0330*
Year	1	0.00002861	1.21	0.2775
Visibility X Year	1	0.00003665	1.55	0.2198
Valence	1	0.00014303	6.03	0.0177*
Visibility X Valence	1	0.00006897	2.91	0.0946
Year X Valence	1	0.00004732	2.00	0.1642
Visibility X Year X Valence	1	0.00010955	4.62	0.0367*
Goal	2	0.00018658	3.93	0.0262*
Visibility X Goal	2	0.00005812	1.23	0.3026
Year X Goal	2	0.00000117	0.02	0.9757
Visibility X Year X Goal	2	0.00014706	3.10	0.0541*
Valence X Goal	2	0.00026079	5.50	0.0071**
Visibility X Valence X Goal	2	0.00007207	1.52	0.2291
Year X Valence X Goal	2	0.00005205	1.10	0.3419
Visibility X Year X Valence X Goal	2	0.00013905	2.93	0.0629

*** = P ≤ .001; ** = P ≤ .01; * = P ≤ .05

The main effects of visibility, goals and valence is significant. The percentage of goal directed statements is different across visibility, year, and valence. There is a much greater percentage of positive statements for the group B-83 in the freedom classification. The A-63 group shows this same trend, but not to the extent of the B-83 group. Both the B-63 and the A-83 groups are balance in the percentage of statements allocated to positive and negative valence. The valence is dependent on which category is being analyzed; for the peace code there is a greater percentage of negative statements for both jobs and freedom the percentage of positive statements is greater with the greatest range between positive and negative in the freedom category.

Analysis of Action Design

The action category is defined as the process which brings about an allocation by force or through a natural agency. As the struggle for civil rights increased several scholars began to look at the methods to achieve the goals of equality (see Chapter II). As a result three rhetorical concepts of resolution emerged, that of assimilation, separation, and revolution. These three concepts are the codes for the action category.

Coding Definition

Phrases, short sentences, and/or statements in this category will be those that refer to the advocation of assimilation, separation or revolution. Specifically, assimilation refers to working within the system to accomplish the goals; separation refers to an autonomous state outside of the current system; and revolution refers to complete change

or renunciation of the system as it currently exists. Each statement once identified will be coded either positive, if it is for the action, or negative, if it is against the action. Only direct action statements should be included (see Appendix A).

There are a total of six classification groups in the action category: (1) assimilation positive (ap); (2) separation positive (sp); (3) revolution positive (rp); (4) assimilation negative (an); (5) separation negative (sn); and (6) revolution negative (rn). Each March grouping has a total of 36 scores to be coded.

Agreement/Reliability

In obtaining the initial interrater agreement in this classification a problem arose between the two raters. As a result the agreement on total statements for the action category were for 1963, 32 percent, and for 1983, 51 percent. While the initial rate of coder agreement was low, the degree of agreement in identifying the code classifications was high with assimilation, 80 percent; revolution, 100 percent; positive, 80 percent; and negative, 100 percent; there were no mutual statements in the separation code.

The Agreed-Upon-Transcripts resolved the differences in classifying and only those statements with active terminology were included such as "vote" or "revolt."

Statistical Analysis

The results of the Agreed-Upon-Transcripts for the action category are listed in Table 4.7. The means for the groups are displayed in Table 4.8.

Table 4.7
Scores for Action Category

Speakers	Positive			Negative		
	Asm	Sep	Rev	Asm	Sep	Rev
A1-63	10	0	1	2	2	2
A2-63	7	0	0	0	1	0
A3-63	3	0	0	0	0	0
B1-63	2	0	0	0	0	0
B2-63	10	0	7	2	0	0
B3-63	4	0	0	0	0	1
A1-83	3	0	4	0	0	0
A2-83	17	0	3	1	0	2
A3-83	7	0	2	0	0	0
B1-83	2	0	0	0	0	0
B2-83	5	0	6	1	0	1
B3-83	5	0	0	0	0	0

Assimilation = Asm; Separtation = Sep; Revolution = Rev.

Table 4.8
Summary of Means: Action Category

Speakers	Positive			Negative		
	Asm	Sep	Rev	Asm	Sep	Rev
A1-63	0.7	0.0	0.2	0.5	0.9	0.0
B1-63	7.9	0.0	3.2	0.9	0.0	0.5
A1-83	7.0	0.0	2.4	0.2	0.0	0.5
B1-83	6.6	0.0	3.0	0.5	0.0	0.5

Assimilation = Asm; Separtation = Sep; Revolution = Rev.

The difference in the means of the number of coded statements was derived from a four way ANOVA using the data in Table 4.8. The results of the ANOVA (summarized in Table 4-9) were that a significant difference was evident in the main effects of valence and action at the 0.001 alpha level.

The interaction analysis revealed that the percentage of statements categorized assimilation, separation, or revolution depended upon whether the valence was positive or negative. There were more positive statements in both the classifications of revolution and assimilation, than negative with a much greater difference spread in the assimilation statements.

Table 4.9
Summary of Four Way ANOVA: Action Category

Source	DF	ANOVA SS	F-Value	Probability
Visibility	1	0.00000163	0.32	0.5730
Year	1	0.00000013	0.03	0.8746
Visibility X Year	1	0.00000089	0.18	0.6761
Valence	1	0.00013237	26.17	0.0001***
Visibility X Valence	1	0.00000187	0.37	0.5457
Year X Valence	1	0.00000061	0.12	0.7295
Visibility X Year X Valence	1	0.00000227	0.45	0.5066
Action	2	0.00017381	17.18	0.0001***
Visibility X Action	2	0.00000389	0.38	0.6829
Year X Action	2	0.00000335	0.33	0.7199
Visibility X Year X Action	2	0.00000203	0.20	0.8185
Valence X Action	2	0.00015066	14.89	0.0001***
Visibility X Valence X Action	2	0.00000293	0.29	0.7496
Year X Valence X Action	2	0.00000158	0.16	0.8562
Visibility X Year X Valence X Action	2	0.00000046	0.05	0.9553

*** = P ≤ .001; ** = P ≤ .01; * = P ≤ .05

Analysis of Appeals Design

The appeals category is defined as the rhetorical technique utilized to advocate the action desired. The types of appeals for classification in this category are emotional, logical and ethical.

Coding Definition

Phrases, short sentences and/or statements in this category will be those that refer to or utilize an appeal to the emotional, logical, or

ethical nature of the audience. Specifically, emotional statements will be those that illicit feelings of good, bad, anger, happiness, sadness, etc.; the logical statements will be those that appeal to reason, providing a structural basis for the rationale; and ethical statements will be those that advocate moral obligation or duty, what is right and good. Once the statements are identified they will be coded as positive or negative depending upon the context of the appeal (see Appendix A). Each statement will only be coded once. When for example an ethical appeal uses logic to support its claim the appeal that illicits the strongest reaction will be coded.

There are a total of six classification groups in the appeals category: (1) emotional position (emp); (2) logical positive (lp); (3) ethical positive (etp); (4) emotional negative (emn); (5) logical negative (ln); and (6) ethical negative (etn). Each March grouping has a total of 36 scores to be coded.

Agreement/Reliability

The initial interrater agreement for the total number of statements in the appeals category was 84 percent for 1963, and 77 percent for 1983. The second method of interrater reliability for the agreement of coding yielded varied differences. For the classification of appeals the category ethical yielded an acceptable percentage of 80 percent. The degree of agreement for both the emotional and logical categories was 40 percent.

Statistical Analysis

The results of the Agreed-Upon-Transcripts for the appeals category are listed in Table 4-10. The means for the groups are displayed in Table 4.11.

Table 4.10
Scores for the Appeals Category

Speakers	Positive			Negative		
	Emotional	Logical	Ethical	Emotional	Logical	Ethical
A1-63	8	6	11	9	4	6
A2-63	2	5	5	2	3	1
A3-63	1	5	6	5	3	5
B1-63	0	1	5	2	0	6
B2-63	0	1	3	5	9	2
B3-63	0	6	11	2	2	2
A1-83	3	10	13	17	7	1
A2-83	15	7	6	2	24	4
A3-83	8	0	6	9	4	2
B1-83	1	0	0	1	0	0
B2-83	0	0	1	4	4	7
B3-83	4	0	5	0	4	0

Table 4.11
Summary of Means: Appeals Category

Group	Positive			Negative		
	Emotional	Logical	Ethical	Emotional	Logical	Ethical
A1-63	3.4	6.5	8.2	5.9	4.0	4.7
B1-63	0.0	4.2	10.3	4.6	5.1	5.9
A1-83	6.9	4.2	6.8	8.0	8.6	1.9
B1-83	2.9	0.0	3.3	2.7	4.2	3.5

The difference in means of the number of statements in the appeals category was obtained by performing a four way ANOVA on the data in Table 4.11. The results of the ANOVA (summarized in Table 4.12) were a

slight significance in the percentage of appeals statements allocated to positive or negative valence with no interaction between visibility or year. The logical and emotional codes showed a greater percentage of statements in the negative valence, while the ethical went counter-trend and recorded the greater percentage in positive valence. There is also a very slight significance in the main effect of visibility.

Table 4.12
Summary of Four Way ANOVA: Appeals Category

Source	DF	ANOVA SS	F-Value	Probability
Visibility	1	0.00006343	3.98	0.0517*
Year	1	0.00001159	0.73	0.3980
Visibility X Year	1	0.00003771	2.37	0.1305
Valence	1	0.00000068	0.04	0.8377
Visibility X Valence	1	0.00000864	0.54	0.4651
Year X Valence	1	0.00000667	0.42	0.5207
Visibility X Year X Valence	1	0.00000008	0.01	0.9422
Appeal	2	0.00002160	0.68	0.5126
Visibility X Appeal	2	0.00004737	1.49	0.2364
Year X Appeal	2	0.00007722	2.42	0.0994
Visibility X Year X Appeal	2	0.00000154	0.05	0.9528
Valence X Appeal	2	0.00010235	3.21	0.0491*
Visibility X Valence X Appeal	2	0.00000242	0.08	0.9271
Year X Valence X Appeal	2	0.00005128	1.61	0.2107
Visibility X Year X Valence X Appeal	2	0.00002316	0.73	0.4887

*** = P ≤ .001; ** = P ≤ .01; * = P ≤ .05

CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Discussion/Conclusions

The purpose of this research was to determine if there were any differences in the messages presented at the 1963 and 1983 Marches on Washington. The results of this study indicate that the content of the nessages from both Marches was far more similar than different. The method of content anlaysis proved to be an adequate tool for objectively determining the relationships within the designated categories. Qualitative differences were apparent in all the categories, however in three of the four categories this difference had no impact on the Marches in relationship to the years.

In the time orientation category there was a significance in difference with the main effect of time, which represented the past, present, and future. It was apparent that the speakers in both Marches focused their time oriented statements in the present. The events immediately preceding and surrounding the 1963 and 1983 Marches were of immediate concern to the speakers. The percentage of statements in the positive and negative valence for the present was greater than the past and future statements combined.

The response to the first research question was no there was not a difference in the reference to time. The speakers in 1963 did not emphasize one specific time reference more so than the speakers in 1983. The messages from all groups revealed a strong emphasis on the present,

with a slightly greater number of positive statements than negative example "I am proud to be here today."

The current events at the time of the Marches had a direct impact on the focus of the speakers; thus a present oriented time referent emerged. Given that the events in the present influence the speakers, why was there a greater number of positive statements? The events surrounding the Marches were not positive. However, the coming together for the Marches was an extremely positive act. Many of the speakers were experiencing the euphoria of being part of a massive audience and verbalized their feelings in their speeches. Statements as "I am proud to be here today"; "I am happy to see so many of you here"; "We've come today"; and other similar expressions served to reflect the positive feelings of being a participant in the Marches.

The answer to research question number two is that there are no differences in the focus on a goal. The category of goals yielded the greatest number of differences, but not as a result of the years of 1963 and 1983. An analysis of the main effects of visibility, year, and goals reflected that there were differences, not only in the single effects, but in the interaction among the three effects. Specifically, the B-83 group had a greater percentage of positive statements than the other three groups combined, with the goal of freedom accounting for two-thirds of the total positive statements. The number of positive statements for this group was five times greater than the number of negative statements. The A-63 group followed this pattern as well with approximately twice the number of positive statements than the negative statements. The A-63 and B-83 groups accounted for the differences in visibility. The B-63 and A-83 groups followed s similar pattern in

their differences, with a balance between the number of positive and negative statements.

The number of positive statements in the B-83 group resulted in the percentage differences in the years, but not in the focus on a particular goal. The speakers in 1983 had a greater percentage of goal oriented statements, than the 1963 speakers, primarily in the positive freedom category, example "Free at last." Another difference in the two groups was that the speakers in 1963 had a greater percentage of negative peace statements, this pattern was prevalent in that category only. Peace was the only goal that had a greater number of negative statements, than positive statements.

There were no differences in the speakers emphases on the type of goal. The 1983 speakers emphasized the goals of the Marches quantitatively more so than the 1963 speakers; a particular significance is the percentage of statements focusing on the goal of freedom in the positive valence. The 1983 speakers' focus on freedom was covered in a much broader spectrum than that of the 1963 speakers. The 1983 speakers viewed freedom in light of unemployment, legislative cuts, and the threat of nuclear war. These issues were not significant in 1963 when the main emphasis of freedom was the obtaining of consititutionally guaranteed rights for Black Americans. There were initial questions on whether the inclusion of the category of peace would have a bearing on the 1963 speakers because it was not a stated theme at the time. There was no problem with the inclusion of the peace goal.

The answer to research question three was that there were no differences in the action advocated. All groups of speakers overwhelmingly advocated the action of assimilation. The speakers reflected

a positive stance towards working within the system. Voting and initiating legislative changes were the actions most frequently stated. The statements for the action form of revolution reflected a more aggressive posture towards changing the system, indicating that there would be changes made. Only one group A-63 indicated the action form of separation. However the indications of separation was in the negative valence and served to support the other actions, with statements that indicated "we (Blacks) cannot walk alone."

There was an initial problem with the methodology in this category. The total number of statements counted by the two raters were substantially different, for both the 1963 and 1983 groups. The difference was primarily in the assimilation classification. As a result of cultural differences this category was not interpreted the same. The initial rater (Black) defined the action of assimilation as an actual overt move towards working within the system. The co-rater (White) interpreted any referent to the system, for example "Bill in Congress" as a positive assimilation. "Bill in Congress" which was a positive referent for the co-rater, meant nothing to the initial rater, who viewed legislation pending or passed as meaningless without a direct overt action to enforce the legislation. During the session to produce the Agreed-Upon-Transcript this culturally bound difference was resolved and only those statements with active terminology, (examples "vote" and "revolt") were included. The results as stated earlier revealed no difference in the groups advocacy of a particular action.

The answer to the final research question is that, there was a difference in the use of appeals between the speakers in 1963 and the speakers in 1983. The speakers in 1963 made a greater percentage of

their statements using positive appeals than the speakers in 1983. Specifically, the ethical appeal was utilized more by the 1963 speakers, example "continue to work with the faith that unarmed suffering gives redemption." Furthermore the ethical appeal was the only one that had a greater percentage of statements in the positive valence. Both the logical and emotional appeals were used to a greater extent to reflect the negative. Both the A-63 and A-83 groups had a greater percentage of positive statements than the B-63 and B-83 groups whose appeals statements leaned towards the negative. Given that this was the only category where the two A groups followed the same pattern, there seems to be an obvious explanation. The A groups for both years included the leaders of groups that advocated changes in the country because it was constitutionally and morally right. In addition, at least half of the group were ministers who were accustomed to anchoring their political views in religious philosophy. As a result both A groups utilized the positive appeals more so than the B groups with the greatest percentage of those statements in the ethical category. The differences in the years were the results of the total number of statements in the category for that year. While the visibility groups A and B followed the same pattern, the number of statements in the ethical positive in 1963 were great enough to balance that groups utilization and direction of appeals towards the ethical positive classification. In 1983 the greatest pecentaage of appeals was in the negative direction with logical emerging as the appeal most utilized. In explaining the use of negative logical appeals in 1983 it is apparent that the cause was the result of the numerous anti-Reagan statements made by the speakers such as "Reagan no more in 1984."

The classification of the statements in this group by the two raters also yielded differences that appeared to be culturally bound. In general, the number of total statements coded yielded an acceptable reliability, but there were differences in the identifying of positive and negative statements and in the coding of the types of appeals. The initial rater (Black) identified approximately twice the number of negative statements, than the co-rater (White). The co-rater identified twice the number of positive statements than the initial rater. An analysis of the results revealed that the initial rater viewed the statements describing the conditions in 1963 as reflecting the negative regardless of whether the negative tone was linked with a positive outcome.

Another difference in the raters was apparent in the classification of appeals. In coding the positive and negative statements once they were identified the raters were in complete agreement. However, only the category on ethical appeals yielded an acceptable percentage. In the areas of emotional and logical, the raters agreed only two out of five times. The emotional and the logical in further analysis was the result of cultural difference, although it was not as clear an explanation for the logical. It was found that the initial rater coded a statement as appealing to rational thought as logical regardless of whether that statement made a biblical reference. The co-rater felt that any biblical reference was ethical. The differences in the emotional classification resulted from the same racial and cultural differences that explained the positive and negative differences. During the process of developing the Agreed-Upon-Transcripts, the differences were resolved through discussion, and statements were

classified depending upon the appeal most prevalent in the statement. To restate the findings in this category, there was a slight difference in the use of appeals between the 1963 and 1983 speakers. The 1963 speakers used to a greater extent the positive ethical appeals and the 1983 speakers used the negative logical appeals.

The concluding results of this content analytical study on the two Marches on Washington is that there is no difference in the rhetoric between the 1963 and 1983 speakers. Both groups focused their addresses to the concerns of the present (at the time of the Marches). Both groups strongly emphasized the theme of freedom significantly more than the themes of jobs or peace, although the definition had expanded in 1983. Both groups advocated working within the system for the betterment of all citizens. The only differences in the groups was in the types of appeals used to provide support for the proposed actions, ethical positive for 1963 and logical negative for 1983. Based on the four categories studied in this research, time orientation, goals, actions, and appeals, the speakers who participated in the 1983 March were repeating the convictions and concerns advocated by the speakers in 1963. The 1983 speakers much like those in 1963 were concerned about the problems of the present that affected the freedom of the citizens of this country. They advocated working within the current system to make the necessary changes that would better the conditions of the economically and politically disadvantaged.

Implications

Yette and Yette (1984) and Marable (1983) have been the only researchers to go beyond the descriptive comparisons of the two Marches

on Washington. Yette and Yette (1984) concluded that both the 1963 and 1983 Marches are a must for understanding the Third American Revolution whereby Black leadership is transformed into national leadership. They viewed both Marches as achieving the same overall goal. Marable (1983) in his political assessment of the 1983 March on Washington, concluded that the scope and depth of the 1983 platform "proved to be a qualitative advance over the 1963 effort."

The findings of this study neither support nor refute the claims of Yette and Yette and Marable. The findings of this study support the fact that regardless of the possibilities of political or economic gains, the speakers were using the same rhetoric in an attempt to achieve those gains, despite the minor qualitative differences.

The marchers who came in 1983 came to Washington, D.C., to rekindle a "dream" and make a recommitment to the ideals of that dream. The dream has yet to be realized despite the gains made both politically, economically, and socially. It may be for this reason that the rhetoric had not changed. The time that was important was the present, not the future or the past. The task was to secure freedom in all ways, for all citizens. This study represents only an initial beginning in analyzing what the messages of those Marches meant.

Future research needs to go beyond what was said to deal with the impact of the speeches. Numerous changes occurred in this country and others as a result of these Marches. What were those changes? How directly did these Marches impact upon those changes? How successful is the concept of mass protest in initiating changes? Can full assimilation ever be realized? What does freedom mean in the eighties? Where the women speakers presenting a different message? Where the non-Black

speakers advocating different goals? The implications for future research is limitless. There are many unanswered questions that could explain the overall condition of the country in the eighties as an outgrowth of the past.

The changes in legislation following the 1963 March on Washington had a significant impact on the status of Blacks in this country. The new legislations passed in the sixties on civil rights, voting rights and equal opportunity provided the means that freed Blacks to pursue their constitutionally guaranteed liberties. The speakers at the 1963 March openly supported these changes in government and witness the materialization of them in the years immediately following the March. In 1983, the speakers sense the need to rekindle the dream of Dr. King in order to halt the processional backwards in economic and political gains. The rhetoric of the speakers, at the 1983 March on Washington, impacted on the passage of the legislation that proclaimed Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birthday as a national holiday. The speakers' platform in 1983 can also be linked either indirectly, or directly, to the bid by Jessie Jackson for President of the United States. Both of these achievements were victories for the morale of Blacks. However, there were no victories that helped to alleviate the economic problems facing Blacks and the other economically disadvantaged in this country. Nor was there any indication of future changes that would serve to halt the steps being taken backwards in civil rights gains, propelled by the current administration.

This study surmizes that the speakers in 1983 were using the same general rhetoric as the speakers in 1963. The times had changed in 1983 and they are still changing. In order to meet the needs of these

changing times the rhetoric used will require reassessment and realignment so that conditions in this country will improve for all citizens and not a chosen few. At the Twenty Fifth Anniversary March on Washington, if it materializes, the speakers and leaders will need to address their rhetoric to reflect the current mood of the nation, and support the actions that are needed to make a significant impact on the conditions in this country and abroad.

APPENDIX A

SAMPLES OF CODED STATEMENTS

Category: Time

1. Past = Five score years ago, a great American in whose symbolic shadow we stand (King, 1963).

2. Present = We come to present ourselves this day (Blake, 1963).

3. Future = The time will come, when we will not confine our marching to Washington (Lewis, 1963).

4. Positive = So let this be the beginning of that great crusade (Reuther, 1963).

5. Negative = Twenty years ago we were stripped of our dignity (Jackson, 1983).

Category: Goals

1. Jobs = Jobs, and a clean environment will rise (Jackson, 1983).

2. Peace = It is quite simply the first step on the long road to peace (Forsberg, 1983).

3. Freedom = Free at last (Wyatt, 1983).

4. Positive = The dream of freedom has been invoked by a veteran (Wyatt, 1983).

5. Negative = The dream is threatened by unemployment (Wyatt, 1983).

Category: Action

1. Assimilation = We have a plan to register to vote like never before (Hooks, 1983).

2. Separation = We cannot walk alone (King, 1963).

3. Revolution = We exist in a coalition of conscience that is going to change this government (Forsberg, 1983).

4. Positive = I have a dream that my four little children will . . . . not be judged by the color of their skin (King, 1963).

5. Negative = We will tear asunder the fabric of American democracy (Reuther, 1963).

Category Appeals

1. Emotional = We are tired of being beaten by policemen; we are tired of seeing our people locked up in jail over and over again (Lewis, 1963).

2. Logical = The Civil Rights Bill now under consideration in the Congress must give new powers to the justice department (Wilkins, 1963).

3. Ethical = Continue to work with the faith that unarmed suffering gives redemption (King, 1963).

4. Positive = Provide jobs and we shall rebuild our decaying intra-structure (Hooks, 1983).

5. Negative = It has created despair, dismay, and doubt among the poor and increased the number of people living in poverty (Hooks, 1983).

APPENDIX B

TRANSCRIPTS STANDARDIZATION: WORD COUNT

Table B.1
Word Count Per Speaker

Speaker	Total Number of Words
A1-63	1,394
A2-63	752
A3-63	590
B1-63	509
B2-63	740
B3-63	646
A1-83	1,271
A2-83	1,478
A3-83	963
B1-83	516
B2-83	662
B3-83	602

Table B.2
Summary of Word Count Per Group

Group	Total Number of Words
A-63	2,736
B-63	1,895
Total - 1963	4,631
A-83	3,712
B-83	1,780
Total - 1983	5,492

REFERENCES

Aarons, L. (1963, August 29). Young and old make bus trip for march. The Washington Post, p. D15.

Agresti, A. & Agresti, B. F. (1979). Statistical methods for the social sciences. San Francisco: Dellen.

Alexander, E. (1983, August 28). There is so much to change. The Washington Post, p. C8.

Anderson, J. (1973). A. Phillip Randolph: A biographical portrait. New York: Harcourt.

Andrews, J. R. (1983). The practice of rhetorical criticism. New York: Macmillan:

Bailey, K. D. (1982). Methods of social research (2nd ed.). New York: Free Press.

Baker, R. E. (1963a, August 27). Leader calls march "Revolution." The Washington Post, p. A1.

Baker, R. E. (1963b, August 29). Largest demonstration on civil rights urges passage of legislation. The Washington Post. pp. A1, A12.

Bardolph, R. (Ed) (1970). The civil rights record: Black Americans and the law, 1849-1970. New York: Crowell.

Barker, K. & Perl, P. (1983, August 28). 250,000 assemble to mark '63 march. The Washington Post, pp. A1, A18.

Baudheim, E.S. & Davis, M. K. (1972). Scales for the measurement of ethos another attempt. Communication Monographs, 39 (4), 296-301.

Becker, S. (1963). Research on emotional and logical proofs. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 25 (1), 208-218.

Bennett, L., Jr., (1963, November). Biggest protest march. Ebony. pp. 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 44, 46, 119, 120, 122, 124.

Bennett, L., Jr. (1979). Wade in the water: Great moments in Black history. Chicago: Johnson.

Berelson, B. (1952). Content analysis in communication research. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Bergman, P. M. (1969). The chronological history of the Negro in America. New York: Harper and Row.

Bishop, J. (1971). The days of Martin Luther King, Jr. New York: Putnam's Sons.

Blair, T. L. (1977). Retreat to the ghetto: The end of a dream? New York: Hill and Wang.

Blumberg, R. L. (1984). Civil rights: The 1960's freedom struggle. Boston: Twayne.

Bonner, A. (1983, August 28). Veterans of '63 reunited in joy, sorrow, nostalgia. The Washington Post, p. A19.

Bosmajian, H. (1982). The inaccuracies in the reprintings of Martin Luther King's "I Have a Dream" speech. Communication Education, 31 (2), 107-114.

Boyle, K. (1963, September). No other place to be. Liberation, p. 9.

Brisbane, R. H. (1970). The Black vanguard: Origins of the Negro social revolution 1900-1960. Valley Forge, PA: Judson.

Brock, B. L. & Scott, R. L. (Eds.) (1980). Methods of rhetorical criticism: A twentieth century perspective (2nd ed., rev.). Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Bruning, J. L., & Kintz, B. L. (1977). Computational handbook of statistics (2nd ed.). Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, and Company.

Budd, R. W., Thorp, R. K., & Donohew, L. (1967). Content analysis of communication. New York: Macmillan.

Burgess, J. & Gregg, S. R. (1983, August 28). No major mishap as 250,000 celebrate. The Washington Post, p. A20.

Carbone, T. (1975, June). Stylistic variables as related to source credibility: A content analysis approach. Communication Monographs 42 (2) 99-106.

Cathcart, R. S. (1980). Defining social movements by their rhetorical form. Central State Speech Journal, 31, 267-273.

Clayton, E. (1963, September). A "Dream" spun in Washington gives nation a new tomorrow. Southern Christian Leadership Newsletter, pp. 2, 8, 9.

Congressional Quarterly (1978, November). Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Service.

Cruse, H. (1967). The crisis of the Negro intellectual. New York: Morrow.

Dellinger, D. (1963a, Summer). Freedom now [Editorial]. Liberation, 8 (5), p. 4.

Dellinger, D. (1963b, September). Seeds of liberation: The first wave. Liberation, 8 (7), pp. 6-7.

D'Emilio, J. (1979). The civil rights struggle: Leaders in profile. New York: Facts on File.

Dennis, L. (1983, November/December). March on Washington ' 83. Black Collegian, pp. 35-37.

Emmert, P., & Brooks, W. D. (Eds.) (1970). Methods of research in communication. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Excerpts from remarks made at civil rights program (1963, August 29). The Washington Post, p. A14.

Excerpts from speeches (1983, August 28). The Washington Post, p. A20.

Fishel, L. H., Jr., & Quarles, B. (1976). The Black American: A documentary history (3rd ed.). Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, and Company.

Flemming, H. C. (1966). The federal executive and civil rights: 1961-1965. In T. Parsons & K. B. Clark (Eds.), The Negro American (pp. 371-400). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Floyd, J. J. & Adams, W. C. (1976). A content-analysis test of Richard M. Weaver's critical methodology. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 41 (4), 374-387.

Foner, P. S. (Ed.) (1972). The voice of Black America: Major speeches by Negroes in the United States 1797-1971. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Franklin, J. H. (1974). From slavery to freedom: A history of Negro Americans (4th ed.). New York: Knopf.

Gardner, C. (1978). Andrew Young: A biography. New York: Drake.

Garfinkel, H. (1959). When Negroes march. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Gerbner, G., Holsti, O. R., Krippendorff, K., Paisley, W. J., & Stone, P. J. (Eds.) (1969). The analysis of communication content: Developments in scientific theories and computer techniques. New York: Wiley and Sons.

Geschwender, J. A. (1978). Racial stratification in America. Dubuque, IA: W. C. Brown.

Glenn, R. W. (1976). Black rhetoric: A guide to Afro-American communication. Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press.

Golden, J. L., & Rieke, R. D. (1971). The rhetoric of Black Americans. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Goldston, R. (1969). The Negro revolution. New York: Macmillan.

Gottschalk, L. A., & Gleser, G. C. (1969). The measurement of psychological states through the content analysis of verbal behavior. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Grant, J. (Ed.) (1968). Black protest: History documents and analyses 1619 to the present. Greenwich, CT: Fawcett.

Harden, B. (1983, August 28). Diverse groups march to different drummers. The Washington Post, pp. A1, A18.

Heath, R. L. (1973). Black rhetoric: An example of the poverty of values. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 39, 145-160.

Himes, J. S. (1973). Racial conflict in American society. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Holsti, O. R. (1969). Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Index to periodical articles by and about Negroes cumulated 1960-1970 (1971). Boston: G. K. Hall.

King, C. S. (Selected by) (1983). The words of Martin Luther King, Jr. New York: Newmarket Press.

King, M. L., Jr. (1963). Why we can't wait. New York: Harper and Row.

Krippendorff, K. (1980). Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Lewis, J. (1963, September). Seed of liberation: A serious revolution. Liberation, 8 (7), p. 8.

Lincoln, C. E. (Ed.) (1970). Martin Luther King, Jr. a profile. New York: Hill and Wang.

Linsley, W. A. (1968). Speech criticism: Methods and materials. Dubuque, IA: Brown.

Lokos, L. (1968). House divided: The life and legacy of Martin Luther King. New Rochelle, NY: Arlington.

Maffre, J. (1963, August 29). March stirs conscience of the world. The Washington Post, p. A18.

Marable, M. (1983, November/December). Jobs, peace, freedom: A political assessment of the August 27 march on Washington. The Black Scholar, 2-20.

March on Washington (1963, September). New South, 18 (9), 3-19.

Matlon, R. J. (Compiled by) (1980). Index to journals in communication studies through 1979. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

McBee, S. (1963, August 29). Restrained militancy marks rally speeches. The Washington Post, p. A14.

McClory, R. (1983, August 28). A day for honoring Dr. King. The Washington Post, p. C8.

McCroskey, J. C. (1966). Special reports: Scales for measurement of ethos. Communication Monographs, 33 (1), 65-72.

Miller, W. R. (1968). Martin Luther King, Jr. New York: Avon.

Milloy, C. (1983, August 28). Voices of experience change this skeptic. The Washington Post, pp. A1, A19.

Mullen, R. W. (1982). Black communication. Washington, DC: University Press of America.

Oates, S. (1982). Let the trumpet sound: The life of Martin Luther King, Jr. New York: Harper and Row.

Official celebration program (1983, August 27). The Washington Post, p. B5.

Organizers (1983). Organizer's manual for the twentieth anniversary celebration of the 1963 March on Washington. Unpublished.

Parsons, T., & Clark, K. B. (Eds.) (1966). The Negro American. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Payne, J. C. (1973). A content analysis of speeches and written documents of six Black spokesmen: Frederick Douglass, Booker T. Washington, Marcus Garvey, W. E. B. Dubois, Martin Luther King, Jr. and Malcom X. Dissertation Abstracts International, 34 (4), 1887A.

Pinkey, A. (1975). Black Americans (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Ploski, H. A., & Kaiser, E. (Eds.) (1971). The Negro almanac (rev. ed.). New York: Bellwether.

Pool, I. (Ed.) (1959). Trends in content analysis. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Portraits in the crowd: 20 years later the dream lives on (1982, August 28). The Washington Post, p. A19.

Quarles, B. (1969). The Negro in the making of America. New York: Macmillan.

Revolution in civil rights (4th ed.) (1968, June). Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Service.

Rosengren, K. E. (Ed.) (1981). Advances in content analysis. Sage Annual Review of Communication Research, (Vol. 9). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Rosenthal, P. I. (1966). The concept of ethos and the structure of persuasion. Communication Monographs, 33 (2), 114-126.

Rustin, B. (1963, October). The meaning of the march. Liberation, pp. 11-13.

Schedule for civil rights march (1963, August 28). The Washington Post, p. A7.

Simons, H. W. (1970). Requirements, problems, and strategies: a theory of persuasion for social movements. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 56 (1), 1-11.

Sitkoff, H. (1981). The struggle for Black equality 1954-1980. New York: Hill and Wang.

Smith, A. L. (1969). Rhetoric of Black revolution. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Smith, A. L. (1972). Language, communication, and rhetoric in Black America. New York: Harper and Row.

Smith, R. R. (1980). The historical criticism of social movements. Central States Speech Journal, 31, 290-296.

Staff (1963a, September). Full text of Dr. King's Washington address. Southern Christian Leadership Conference Newsletter, pp. 5, 8.

Staff (1963a, October). SNCC head calls for new protests: Lewis speech calls for action now. The Student Voice [Newsletter for the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee], p. 1.

Staff (1963b, October). Text of Lewis' speech at Washington. The Student Voice, [Newsletter for the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee] pp. 1, 3, 4.

Staff (1963b, September). 250,000 make history in huge Washington march. Southern Christian Leadership Conference Newsletter, pp. 1, 3.

Stewart, C. J., Donovan, J. O., & Mohrmann, G. P. (Eds.) (1973). Explorations in rhetorical criticism. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Thonssen, L., Baird, A. C., & Braden, W. W. (1970). Speech criticism (2nd ed.). New York: The Ronald Press.

Tucker, R. K. , Weaver, R. L., II, & Berryman-Fink, C. (1981). Research in speech communication. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Ventry, I. M., & Schiavetti, N. (1980). Evaluating research in speech pathology and audiology. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Walton, H., Jr. (1971). The political philosophy of Martin Luther King, Jr. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

What JFK said about march (1963, September). Southern Christian Leadership Conference Newsletter, p. 2.

White, R. D. (1983, August 28). 54 hours on a bus to rally under boiling sun: All for a cause. The Washington Post, p. A21.

Wilkins, R., with Matthews, T. (1982). Standing fast: The autobiography of Roy Wilkins. New York: Viking Press.

Williams, J. C., & Williams, M. (Eds.) (1970). The Negro speaks: The rhetoric of contemporary Black leaders. New York: Noble.

Yette, F. W., & Yette, S. F. (1984). Washington and two marches 1963 and 1983: The third American revolution. Silver Springs, MD: Cottage Books.

Zangrando, R. L. (1963, December). The direction of the march. The Negro History Bulletin, 27 (3), pp. 60-64.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Gail E. Armstead, was born in Quincy, Florida in 1952. At an early age, her family moved to Jacksonville, Florida, where she pursued her early years of education. After graduating from William M. Raines High School in 1970, she went on to earn the Bachelor of Arts and Master of Science degrees from Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, in the fields of mass communication and speech. She has held numerous administrative and supervisory positions for the City of Jacksonville, in the Employment and Training Division. She is currently employed as an administrator in the University of Florida, College of Business Administration. She is a member of several professional organizations including the NAACP, Academy of Management, and the Southern Speech Association.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Norman N. Markel, Chairman
Professor of Speech

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Donald E. Williams, Co-Chairman
Professor of Speech

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Anthony J. Clark
Associate Professor of Speech

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Mildred Hill-Lubin
Associate Professor of English

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the Department of Speech in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and to the Graduate School and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

May, 1985

Madelyn Lockhart, Dean, Graduate School